DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 693 UD 020 347

AUTHOR Salley, Columbus
TITLE The PTA in the Urban Context: A Final Report on the Urban Education Project Phase I.
INSTITUTION National PTA, Chicago, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.: Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Oct 79
CONTRACT 300-79-0333
NOTE 95p.: Photographs may be minimally reproducible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *City Problems; *Futures (of Society); Planning; Public Policy; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS *National PTA Urban Education Project

ABSTRACT

The Urban Education Project was implemented to help the National PTA realize its historical commitment to reversing the deterioration of human life in urban centers, especially in schools, and to emphasizing the actual and potential strengths of diverse publics collaborating in dealing with urban problems. Six hearings were held to identify and select crucial concerns of urban areas, to examine effective solutions, and to develop new problem-solving strategies. Results of these hearings are described in this report, as are criteria for site and testifier selection and methodology and procedures used to collect and interpret data. The hearing cases are presented with information about problems, solutions and resources. A cross-site analysis of problems, solutions, and resources is presented and future actions are discussed. Tables of data are included. (Author/MK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FEB 2 8 1980

ED183693

THE PTA IN THE URBAN CONTEXT: A FINAL REPORT ON THE URBAN EDUCATION PROJECT PHASE I

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by Columbus Salley
for the National PTA

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra Fink
National PTA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 020347

© The National PTA • 700 North Rush Street • Chicago, Illinois 60611

PREFACE

The Urban Education Project of the National PTA began in November 1977, when Grace Baisinger, then National PTA president and chairperson of the Urban Advisory Task Force, invited various parents, PTA officers, educators, health care and social service providers, business and labor leaders, government officials, and representatives of other organizations to serve on an Urban Advisory Task Force.

The implementation of the Urban Education Project was one of the identified strategies of the National PTA in helping it to realize its historical commitment of reversing the deterioration of human lives in our urban centers, especially in our schools, and, at the same time, emphasizing the actual and potential strengths of diverse publics collaborating in dealing with urban problems. In September of 1978, the Task Force concluded that a necessary beginning in realizing the PTA's goal would be through a series of public hearings, which would provide the most instructive way of gathering information and insights from diverse publics on recurring problems and issues affecting urban centers and schools. The four principal objectives of these hearings were:

To identify the crucial problems confronting urban areas and their schools

To select the most pressing concerns

To examine the effective ways in which various cities across the country are responding to these challenges

To develop new and dynamic strategies for solving urban problems, with parents being the leading force in this endeavor.

Six hearings were conducted across the country in the following cities: Philadelphia (November 14, 1978); Seattle (January 16, 1979); Houston (February 6, 1979); Miami (February 20, 1979); Kansas City, Missouri (March 6, 1979); and Detroit (March 20, 1979). Two hundred forty-six testifiers representing a cross-section of urban publics, e.g., business, school leaders, students, government officials, teachers, labor leaders, community leaders, clergy, PTA, and citizens/parents shared their opinions and concerns about the problems, solutions, and resources to be considered or addressed when responding to the National PTA's theme for these

hearings: "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" In addition to these hearings, a National Conference entitled "The PTA Challenges the Nation's Leaders: What Can We Do for Our Schools?" was held in Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1979 at an HEW Building. Fourteen participants, representing diverse national organizations and federal agencies, discussed their concerns and perceptions about the problems and issues identified in the six hearings, with members of the Urban Advisory Task Force.

The major results of Phase I of the Urban Education Project—from the formation of the Task Force in November 1977 to the National Conference of May 1979—are the subject of this report.

A few words about the organization of this report: Chapter 1 describes in greater detail the background of the Urban Education Project, including the selection and deliberations of the Urban Advisory Task Force and a historic perspective of the National PTA's involvement in urban life.

Chapter 2 looks at the criteria for site and testifier selections and the descriptive methodology and procedures used to collect and analyze data emanating from Phase I activities.

In Chapter 3, seven cases are presented, including the six hearings and the Washington Conference. The six hearing cases are organized according to panel members present; list of problems, solutions, and resources cited; list of testifiers with their most frequently cited or modal problems, solutions, and resources; and a brief summary of the findings at each site, viewing the testifiers as a whole and by group interests.

In regard to the National Conference, the data are organized according to panel members present, and salient highlights of conferees' responses to the problems, solutions, and resources identified through the six public hearings.

Chapter 4 presents a cross-site analysis of the problems, solutions, and resources relating to urban issues that were identified and discussed by testifiers and conferees.

In Chapter 5, a summary of the major outcomes of Phase I and a discussion of future actions based on hearing data and Task Force deliberations are presented.

The author would like to acknowledge the support and encouragement of the National PTA leadership—Grace Baisinger, Immediate Past President; Virginia Sparling, President; Harley McMillen, Director of Program Development; Becky Schergens, Executive Director; and Sandra Fink, Director of Public Relations; the Urban Advisory Task Force, and Local PTA Hearing Coordinators: Anna Lee Dowling (Philadelphia), Kay Groves (Seattle), Hester Herbster (Houston), Marge Okasako (Miami), Norma Phillips (Kansas City, Missouri), and Mary Brand (Detroit), who made this a pleasant learning experience.

Columbus Salley
Human Resources Center
University of Chicago
National Consultant to
The Urban Education Project
October 1979

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background on the Urban Education Project and a Historic Perspective of the National PTA's Involvement in the Urban Context	7
Criteria for Selection of Testifiers and Sites and Methodology	19
Seven Cases of the Urban Education Project Phase I	
Philadelphia	25
Seattle	33
Houston	41
Miami	49
Kansas City, Missouri	57
Detroit	65
National Conference	72
Cross-site Analysis of Six Hearings and National Conference	79
Summary of Phase I Outcomes and Discussion of Future Actions	91

STONE
SCHOOL
7

BACKGROUND ON THE URBAN EDUCATION PROJECT AND A HISTORIC PERSPECTIVE ON THE NATIONAL PTA'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE URBAN CONTEXT

1

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the background of the Urban Education Project, including the formation of the Urban Advisory Task Force and its deliberations, and the continuing role of the National PTA in urban life.

BACKGROUND ON URBAN EDUCATION PROJECT

The PTA has always been involved in urban education, and has consistently believed that the vitality of the public schools is the most significant measure of the value that cities place upon the quality of life they offer their people.

Many American cities, both large and small, are experiencing progressive deterioration in living and employment conditions. This "urban blight" is also finding dramatic expression in the classroom, where forces from outside of education are impacting directly upon the lives of our young people, creating a negative or even non-learning environment where abilities and skills are never developed. The youngsters who are the products of these cities and schools frequently cannot be absorbed into the community or the economy as contributing members.

To help stop this vicious circle—and the waste of a generation of youth—the National PTA, in November of 1977, created an Urban Education Project. Objectives of the project were:

To focus national attention on the problems plaguing urban areas and the schools within them

To generate new and dynamic approaches to their resolution

To make parents and their children the leading force in this endeavor.

In making this major commitment, the PTA renewed its historic determination that *all* children be provided with a foothold to the future, rather than the despair of undeveloped potential, the promise of unemployment, and the end of hope.

URBAN ADVISORY TASK FORCE

Seeking to involve those to whom the viability of cities and schools was an issue of concern, Grace Baisinger, then National PTA President and Chairperson of the Urban Advisory Task Force, invited prominent educational, community, health care, and social service leaders, and PTA officers from across the country, to serve on an Urban Advisory Task Force in November of 1977. The formation of the Urban Advisory Task Force signaled the renewed commitment of the PTA to problems and opportunities endemic to urban areas in general and to urban schools in particular.

The 39 members of the Urban Advisory Task Force included: David Asai, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA; Grace Baisinger; Milton Bins, Senior Associate, Council of Great City Schools, Washington, D.C.; George Brown, Immediate Past-Lt. Gov. of Colorado and Vice-president, Marketing, Grumman Eco-systems Corporation; Dr. Angeline Caruso, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, IL; Dr. John L. Crew, Sr., Superintendent of Schools, Baltimore, MD; Dr. Alonzo Crim, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, GA; Dr. John Dobbs, Assistant Superintendent, Office of School and Community Affairs, State Department of Education, Lansing, MI; Mrs. John Donalek, Talcott School Advisory Council, Chicago; Jean F. Dye, Vice-president for Legislative Activity, National PTA, Chicago, IL; Lenora Dyxin, Past President, Chicago Region PTA, and currently Secretary, Illinois PTA; Dr. Nolan Estes, Past President, Council of Great City Schools, and former superintendent, Dallas Independent School District, Dallas, TX; Dr. Walter C. Farrell, Jr., Department of Community Education, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI; Dr. Val Flores, Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Texas, Austin, TX; Dr. Gene Geisert, Superintendent, New Orleans Public Schools, New

Orleans, LA; Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Dean of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI; Delores Gulledge, Teacher and Past President, Louisiana PTA, Shreveport, LA; Patricia Harbour, Director, HEW Secretariat IYC, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Robert Hill, Director, Research Department, National Urban League, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Asa Hilliard, Dean of Education, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, CA; Dr. David W. Hornbeck, Superintendent, State Department of Education, Baltimore, MD; Dr. Jesse Jackson, President, Operation PUSH, Chicago, IL; Dr. Arthur Jefferson, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, MI; Dr. Caryl M. Kline, Secretary of Education, State Department of Education, Harrisburg, PA; Doris Leftakes, Past President, Chicago Region PTA, Chicago, IL; Dr. Ruth Love, Superintendent, Oakland Public Schools, Oakland, CA; Robert A. MacGregor, President, Chicago United, Chicago, IL; Dr. Michael P. Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, School District of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, PA; Ruby Murchison, Teacher and Member, Commission on Individual Development, National PTA, Chicago, IL; Edna Polin, Vice-president, Region 1, National PTA, Chicago, IL; Vincent E. Reed, Superintendent, District of Columbia Schools, Washington, D.C.; Gloria Roberts, former Vice-president, Region 2, National PTA, Chicago, IL; Rocelia Roman, National Coordinator, Fellowship Program, ASPIRA of America, Washington, D.C.; Becky L. Schergens, Executive Director, National PTA, Chicago, IL; Dr. Mark Shedd, Commissioner of Education, State Department of Education, Hartford, CT; Virginia V. Sparling, President, National PTA, Chicago, IL; Dr. Gerda Steele, Director of Educational Services, National Association for Advancement of Colored People, New York, NY; Dr. David Stratman, former Director of Governmental Relations, National PTA, Washington Office, Washington, D.C.; and Dr. Leonard Valverde, Associate Professor, Department of Educational Administration, University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Harley McMillen, Director of Program Development for the PTA, was designated as Project Director, and Dr. Columbus Salley of the Human Resources Center, University of Chicago, was selected as National Consultant to the Urban Education Project.

The specific charge of the Task Force was:

To identify the problems and issues confronting our cities

To prioritize areas of concern where the National PTA can act

To develop strategies for finding solutions to these selected urban problems.

The first meeting of the Task Force was held December 5, 1977, at the National PTA in Chicago. This meeting resulted in the Task Force (1) identifying some major concerns/problems peculiar to urban areas and their schools and (2) prioritizing these concerns/problems into long- and short-range goals as gollows:

LONG RANGE

Parent training and education
Professional development of teachers, counselors, and administrators
Student achievement

SHORT RANGE

Parent involvement
Youth employment
Development of common goals
Review of assessment practices and tests

Two additional Task Force meetings were held in March and September of 1978. In these meetings, the Task Force further identified some of the urgent problems and issues confronting urban areas and schools. Also, the members prepared a "Declaration of Commitment" to address these problems and issues, and recommended that an effective way of gathering more specific information and insights on urban problems and solutions would be to conduct public hearings in various cities across the U.S. The Task Force suggested that public hearings in local areas would permit the collection of information from people who are most directly affected by the problems of their urban schools.

DECLARATION OF COMMITMENT

The following statement of the rationale, with a course of action for dealing with the urgent social and economic problems confronting urban areas, was adopted by the Task Force in September 1978:

The National PTA believes that the deterioration of American cities directly affects the present and future lives of millions of parents and children. The urban blight that is slowly pervading both large and small cities has found its ultimate—and deadly—target in our schools, where forces from outside of education are impacting directly upon the lives of our young people.

The serious problems include shrinking urban tax bases, which result in choices having to be made over which students' needs will *not* be met; declining test scores, which reflect undeveloped abilities and potential; and a 40 percent unemployment rate among minority youths, indicating that those going through the school are fully aware that many of their friends, their brothers and sisters, and their parents are unemployed—and that the same hopeless future awaits them. *We stand in danger of wasting a major portion of a generation of our youth,* if we continue to permit this steady deterioration of our cities and their educational systems.

The PTA believes that the vitality of our schools is the most significant measure of the value our cities place upon the quality of life they offer their people. To enhance this quality of life, and to provide a positive educational environment in which all children can grow and learn, we are making a major commitment to bring to national awareness the scope and nature of these problems; to encourage a national effort to resolve them; and to make parents and their children the leading force in this endeavor.

In attaining these goals, we seek to involve all those to whom the viability of American cities and schools is an issue of concern: parents, educators, health care providers, business and labor leaders, governmental officials, and representatives of other organizations which have long struggled with the problems of urban education.

In the course of urban schoolchildren's lives, many people will affect their education and development. But it is the parents of these children who have the most enduring commitment, and the greatest determination that their children learn the skills they need to survive and succeed.

Consistent with our conviction that parents must be a leading force for change in the urban schools, the National PTA will hold hearings in cities across the country. The hearings will serve as a forum for parents and other members of the urban com-

munity—to whom the success of the public schools is vital—for identifying the problems which affect children's education, and for developing the goals that urban education should meet. It is hoped that individuals and organizations participating in the hearings will form local coalitions responsible for effecting change within their school systems.

We in the PTA are convinced that in helping to bring the problem of the city schools to sustained national attention, we will do an important service for all our children. There are few schools—whether in rural or suburban areas—that are not experiencing some of the educational problems which plague city schools. Some of the pressures that have traditionaliy been associated with low-income families are now being felt by *most* families: the need for several incomes; the pressures of long work hours and of never-ending inflation; the fear or reality of unemployment. In addition, the same despair about the future, which is palpable in the classrooms of inner-city high schools, has found its way into many suburban institutions. However, these difficulties have reached extreme proportions for the children in urban schools. It is time for the PTA and it is time for the nation to deal with them.

The National PTA declares its commitment to the parents and children whom these problems directly affect.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Six public hearings entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" were scheduled for six cities: Philadelphia (November 14, 1978), Seattle (January 16, 1979), Houston (February 6, 1979), Miami (February 20, 1979), Kansas City, Missouri (March 6, 1979), and Detroit (March 20, 1979).

The four principle objectives of these hearings were:

To identify and clarify the crucial problems confronting urban areas and their schools;

To select the most pressing concerns;

To examine effective ways in which various cities across the U.S. are responding to these challenges; and

To develop new and dynamic strategies for solving urban problems, with parents being the leading force in this endeavor.

More specifically, the public hearings were designed to serve as a forum in which parents, students, civic leaders, school administrators, and other interested individuals would have the opportunity to discuss the urgent educational problems of our cities and to suggest possible solutions. Various members of the Urban Advisory Task Force would act as panel members at these public hearings, along with officials of the National PTA.

In addition to these six hearings, a National Conference entitled "The PTA Challenges the Nation's Leaders: What Can We Do for Our Schools?" was planned for Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1979. A more detailed discussion of the format and criteria for site and testifier selections for these hearings and the National Conference will be presented in the next chapter.

The concluding section of this chapter will give a brief historic perspective of the PTA's involvement in urban life.

A HISTORIC PERSPECTIVE OF THE NATIONAL PTA'S INVOLVEMENT IN THE URBAN CONTEXT

Since its founding in 1897, the PTA has always been interested in the problems of urban education and youth. For example, when the total membership of the PTA consisted of only about 2,000 members in its early years, local PTA organizations were concentrated in the urban centers of the U.S. As a result, the activities of these local PTAs often centered on those issues reflecting urban life, e.g., resolving problems regarding education and employment of children, generating cooperation with public agencies interested in child welfare services, and promoting parent-teacher cooperation in the local schools. From its beginning, therefore, the PTA consistently has maintained that the vitality of the public schools is the most significant measure of value that cities can place on the quality of life they offer their inhabitants. The state of some of our cities and urban schools today, however, offers some substantial reasons for concern about this measure of value.

Currently, the National PTA consists of approximately 6.1 million members, organized through nearly 28,000 local units and 52 state PTAs/PTSAs (parent-teacher-student associations) across the U.S. The concentration of this PTA membership, however, is no longer located in the urban centers of our nation. Thus, many of the issues and activities of the local PTAs are diverse, and reflect those concerns of a more geographically dispersed membership.

Nevertheless, the National PTA is convinced that, in helping to bring the problems of city schools to sustained national attention for everyone, it will do an important service for *all* of our children. There are few schools, for example, whether urban, rural, or suburban, that are not experiencing some of the same problems that are plaguing our city schools, e.g., the pressures of inflation, tight educational budgets, expansion of state and federally mandated programs, and increased limitations on employment opportunities for high school graduates. These kinds of problems cross the boundaries defined by geographical location. The important difference for urban schools is the fact that such problems often are proportionately greater in the urban centers. Thus, the problems general to all schools take on different meanings and possible consequences when combined with inner-city blight, high unemployment, and a declining tax base—those specific problems often faced by urban schools.

Also, it is important to mention that the students of our city schools are members of our larger society, whether or not they are provided the necessary skills and opportunities for productive employment. Those students who are disadvantaged economically, educationally, or socially by the conditions found in our cities should be of concern to everyone. The social and economic costs of gross inequities are too great to be ignored. Further, the National PTA defines "urban education" as a name that refers to the location where the education takes place, not a name to imply generally different goals or outcomes for some of our children. Too often, youngsters who are the products of deteriorating cities and schools cannot be—through no fault of their own—absorbed into the community or economy as productive and contributing members. The unfortunate results are often both a waste of human resources and of human potential.

Many of the social and economic conditions that impact on the educational systems of our major cities are well known. The more general ones are:

High levels of unemployment, especially among youth;

A general flight of the middle class (both black and white) to the suburbs;

A deteriorating tax-base with declining populations in most major cities;

A lack of parental and broad-based community participation in the local schools; and

A declining value placed on education.

Currently, the unemployment rate among inner-city youth is over 40 percent in many of our major cities. Even this figure of 40 percent, however, is probably underestimated because of the number of teenagers who withdraw from the labor force and, therefore, are not reflected in the U.S. Department of Labor's unemployment statistics. While a great deal has been written about the unemployment situation for city and, particularly, minority youth, the simple fact is that there are not enough jobs available in many of our urban centers. The suggestion is often made in discussions about minority youth that jobs are available, if minority youth had the skills and proper motivation to find them. Such explanations tend to ignore the fact that the skills of minority youth are often greater than the skill levels of the jobs most available to them. Also, besides their own joblessness, the unemployment of family members and friends has a significant effect on many of the urban young. As a consequence of unemployment for themselves and the effect on others, many of these urban youngsters may place little value on education.[1] Minority youth from the inner cities become frustrated and resentful when they and their friends cannot find employment, even if they have completed their high school programs. Consequently, they place little value on completing high school.[2]

Declining city populations and the flight of the middle class (both black and white) to the suburbs have several impacts on education in urban centers: First, there is the loss of economic vitality in the city as the remaining population becomes more impoverished; second, there is a loss of urban leadership that is vitally needed for the community and schools; and third, there may be a further decline in the tax-base of urban centers as property values tend to go down. This shrinking fiscal capacity of urban centers has often resulted in a dependence on state and federal aid, in addition

---

[1] Ogbu, J., *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. A Carnegie Report. NY: Academic Press, 1977.

[2] Morgan, G. D., *The Ghetto College Student*. Iowa City: American College Testing Program, 1970.

to inhibiting the development of innovative programs designed to correct some of the educational problems of urban youth.

Meaningful involvement of parents in their children's education has been difficult to achieve in some cities for a variety of reasons. The idea that parents have little to contribute, or are a potential threat, is not an uncommon view held in some urban schools. In many instances, it is only when something goes wrong concerning the child—a truancy problem, a failing grade, a reading handicap—that parental involvement is encouraged by the schools. Also, many parents frequently feel a sense of powerlessness to influence their schools or their local education system to meet the educational needs of their children. In most situations, however, parents want to help when they feel that they know how and—sometimes—if they are simply asked.

In summary, most of these and the other factors that impact on our urban schools cannot be isolated, i.e., the various social, economic, and educational problems interact and, in combination, tend to further the depressed conditions of many of our urban centers and urban schools. This circular effect of the factors of deterioration in inner cities compounds the issues and problems for urban centers and their educational systems.[3]

In the next chapter, the format, the criteria for site and testifier selections for the hearings and the National Conference, and the methodology and procedures used to collect and analyze data from the same will be discussed.

[3] Ogbu, *op. cit.*

CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF TESTIFIERS AND SITES AND METHODOLOGY

2

The purpose of this chapter is to present the criteria used by the Urban Advisory Task Force in selecting sites and testifiers for the public hearings and National Conference, and to discuss some methodological and procedural concerns related to the data gathered and analyzed during Phase I of the Urban Education Project, i.e., from the formation of the Task Force in November 1977 to the National Conference in May 1979.

CRITERIA FOR SITE SELECTION

Through its deliberations from December 1977 through September 1978, the Task Force identified the following criteria for sites to be involved in the public hearings on urban education: sites should have populations of 100,000 or greater, and local citizens who (1) demonstrate a willingness to deal with current social and other school problems, (2) have eminent leadership, (3) have demonstrated interest in problems and strategies to which the hearings relate, (4) have a favorable time frame for participating in these hearings, (5) provide a geographical spread so as to accommodate, in part, our general goal of showing the interface between urban and non-urban problems, (6) provide a different power base and different size among all sites selected, and (7) have probable linkages with resources and networks to help solve some of the problems identified through these hearings.

Using the above criteria, the Task Force identified the following cities as possible hearing sites: Chicago; New York; Atlanta; Dallas; Los Angeles; Detroit; Washington, D.C.; Seattle; New Orleans; San Francisco; Denver; Philadelphia; Boston; Minneapolis;

Newark; Kansas City, Missouri; Portland; Miami; Baltimore; Columbus; Omaha; Las Vegas; Pittsburgh; Cleveland; St. Louis; Houston; and Phoenix.

The six cities selected were: Philadelphia; Seattle; Houston; Miami; Kansas City, Missouri; and Detroit.

CRITERIA FOR TESTIFIER SELECTION

In seeking to generate information and to share ideas among appropriately diverse school-community groups as they related to the urban problems and challenges, the Task Force established the following criteria for the selection of testifiers at the public hearings: testifiers should (1) represent both men and women in diverse social roles in the community and (2) represent some ability to make things happen for local schools in the overall area. Testifiers should be anybody (inside or outside of the schools), and should not be limited to the so-called "progressive reform elements" in the community.

The criteria utilized for selecting conferees for the National Conference were: (1) a demonstrated commitment to helping solve urban problems and (2) potential in facilitating national coalition building in dealing with urban problems. Washington, D.C., was selected as the site for the National Hearing because of its obvious strategic location to the conferees and its media coverage.

METHODOLOGY

Methodology in this report is limited to the methods and/or procedures used by the PTA in helping the Urban Advisory Task Force to realize its charge of: identifying the problems and issues confronting our cities; prioritizing areas of concern where the National PTA can act; and developing strategies for finding solutions to selected urban problems.

The methods used to accomplish these goals during Phase I of the Urban Education Project were: (1) the deliberations of the Urban Advisory Task Force, (2) the public hearings and National Conference, and (3) a descriptive analysis of the data from the hearings and Conference. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

TASK FORCE DELIBERATIONS

Among its first tasks, the Urban Advisory Task Force identified some of the salient problems and issues of urban areas and urban schools.

The recurring problems and issues cited were:

A. Youth Crime and Violence and Vandalism
B. New Ways of Financing Public Education/Special Financing
C. Discipline
D. Public Attitudes About Inner-City Schools
E. Inflation Factors Affecting Schools
F. Youth Unemployment/General Unemployment
G. Housing
H. Decline of Health and Social Services
I. Low Academic Achievements and Performance
J. Decline of Urban Tax Base or "White Flight"
K. Need for Multicultural and Multilingual Programs
L. Teacher Performance
M. Administrator and Instructional Staff-Improvement Needs
N. Conflicts from Political and Self-Interest Groups

The Task Force's identified problems represented those of substantive importance to the communities from which they sought clarification on problems and issues about which they *had not* as yet come to closure.

It was the consensus of the Task Force that a viable strategy or means of gaining further insights into these problems would be through the public hearing format.

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND NATIONAL CONFERENCE FORMATS

The hearings and National Conference were to specifically do the following: (1) generate information and share ideas among an appropriately diverse school-community group, where participants would be asked to discuss representative problems and alternatives and not defend their own pet solutions; (2) generate strategies for solution of problems, and then for joint action by the National PTA and all these groups.

The specific questions asked of testifiers in preparation for testimony at the hearings were:

1. What do you think of our list of problems?
   a. How would you prioritize them?
   b. Any additions or deletions?
2. What solutions would you offer for them? Are you familiar with any exemplary programs that address any of the problems you have identified?
3. What is the single, most pressing problem in your community? How does this problem relate to schools, to young people?
   a. What is the "ideal" solution to this problem?
   b. Who has the power to effect this solution (city, state, federal government, local groups, others)?
   c. How can the PTA best assist in effecting this solution (at local, state, and national levels)?
4. What specific programs does your organization have to help the children and youth of this city cope with their problems?
5. What studies have you or your group made about the problems of children and youth in this community, and what conclusions come from them?
6. What resources or means to obtain resources exist in this community to assist in the development of programs which will benefit children and youth?
7. What have you been able to identify as the chief factors which impede the solution of the problems facing children and youth in this community?
8. Would you recommend any type of new federal legislation to help address some of the critical problems you have identified?

Each of the hearings used the following format: A panel made up of Task Force members and local leaders; testifiers were given up to ten minutes for the preparation of their testimony; ten minutes were allowed for questions and answers from panel members; testifiers were encouraged to prepare written testimony; and the proceedings were recorded. A short report on each hearing was made available three to five weeks after the same.

The National Conference differed from the hearing format in that conferees were asked to respond to the five most frequently cited problems from the six public hearings. The specific questions asked of the conferees in light of these problems were: What resources are available, either from your organization, or in collabo-

ration with other national organizations, for dealing with these problems? What do you perceive to be the barriers or obstacles in resolving these issues? What, specifically, has your organization done in these problem areas? What model situations are you aware of that have successfully addressed these problems? What might be done among national organizations to effect change in local areas?

Additional modifications in the National Conference format were that the panel consisted of *Task Force members only*, and that conferees and panel members were given up to 20 minutes to present and ask questions, respectively.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF RESULTS FROM HEARINGS AND NATIONAL CONFERENCE

Written presentations by testifiers and conferees, and transcripts of the hearings and National Conference, are the data base for this report. After a perusal of these documents, and after extensive discussion with members of the Urban Advisory Task Force and National PTA leadership, it became evident that a descriptive mode of reporting out the results of Phase I of the Urban Education Project was appropriate.

This decision was further buttressed by the following facts: (1) The lack of controls on who ultimately were selected as testifiers and conferees made it difficult to generalize about the views of those who chose not to testify. (2) The complex of divergent views on urban education among testifiers and conferees made it difficult to identify common variables among them that could be measured and controlled in a hearing or conference format. (3) Many testifiers and conferees did not mention all the Task Force's concerns. This created a distortion as to the importance or priority that could be assigned to the problems, solutions, and resources discussed.

Thus, the descriptive mode was the only feasible method of those available for analyzing the data from the hearings and National Conference.

The following procedures were used to accomplish descriptive analyses of the results of Phase I of the Urban Education Project:

1. An item analysis of responses to the problems presented at the hearings.
2. A listing of the frequencies of citations of problems, solutions, and resources from each hearing site.
3. A listing of the testifiers.

4. An analysis of the testifiers by group interests.
5. A cross-site analysis of commonalities and differences among hearing sites.

The next chapter will present the findings from each of the public hearings and from the National Conference.

SEVEN CASES OF THE URBAN EDUCATION PROJECT PHASE I

3

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the results or findings from the six public hearings conducted in Phadelphia; Seattle; Houston; Miami; Kansas City, Missouri; Detroit; and the National Conference conducted in Washington, D.C. The data for these seven cases were analyzed, using the descriptive mode in light of the method and procedures discussed in Chapter 2.

Each case from the public hearing is organized by panel members present; lists of problems, solutions, and resources cited by testifiers; a list of testifiers with their most frequently cited modal problems, solutions, and resources by code; and a summary of the findings at each site, looking at the testifiers as a whole and by their group interests, i.e., business, school leaders, students, government officials, PTA members, teachers, labor leaders, community leaders, clergy, parents/citizens, and sex. (These categories were the most logical and feasible in looking for grouped interests among the testifiers).

The data from the National Conference are organized by conferees and panel members present, and the salient highlights of conferees' responses to the major problems, solutions, and resources identified through the six public hearings.

It should be noted that the designation of "major problems" in these cases is an interpretation from the emphases given by testifiers in their oral and/or written testimony.

A. PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA HEARING

The first of six national hearings by the National PTA on urban life and urban schools entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities:

What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" was held in Philadelphia, November 14, 1978, at University City High School, 36th and Filbert Street. For ten hours, testimony was offered by 42 testifiers representing a spectrum of the Philadelphia community—civic leaders, high school and college students, school administrators, parents, business and labor leaders, politicians, and representatives of diverse community and educational groups.

PANEL MEMBERS

A panel of eight members representing the National PTA's Urban Advisory Task Force engaged in a process of listening and dialoguing with testifiers around issues and solutions that were most pressing to the testifiers. The panel members were: Grace Baisinger, then President of the National PTA; The Honorable George Brown, Immediate Past Lieutenant Governor of Colorado; Dr. John Dobbs, Assistant Superintendent, Michigan State Department of Education; Anna Lee Dowling, President, Pennsylvania PTA; Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Dean of Education, Michigan State University; Gloria Roberts, then Regional Vice-president, National PTA; Virginia Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA; Dr. Leonard Valverde, Department of Educational Administration, University of Texas; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

CITED PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND RESOURCES

CODE	PROBLEMS
1	Crime, violence and vandalism
2	Inadequate financing of public education
3	Discipline
4	Inflation
5	Negative public attitudes about public education
6	General unemployment/Youth unemployability
7	Inadequate housing
8	Decline of health and social services
9	Low academic achievement and poor student performance
10	Decline of urban tax base
11	Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators

CODE	PROBLEMS (continued)
12	Conflicts from political and self-interest groups
13	Racism
14	Length of school year
15	Appointed school boards
16	Teacher unions
17	Desegregation
18	Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
19	Inadequate funding of parochial schools
20	Uniform age requirements for beginning school and social promotions
21	Large class sizes
22	Inadequate supplies and materials
23	Duplication of services by state and local agencies
24	Concentration of older people in inner cities

CODE	SOLUTIONS
A	Full state funding
B	Increased federal funding
C	Modified school year
D	Elected school boards
E	Systematic and compulsory management training for principals
F	Programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers
G	Mandatory state employment of unemployed and unemployable
H	Cooperation between government and school personnel before legislation
I	Government sponsored tax credits for rehabilitation of older buildings
J	Increased development of service and tourism industries
K	More parental involvement in total educative process
L	Making education a national concern
M	Alternative methods of financing public education
N	Student job training
O	Creation of parenting centers
P	Regionalization of tax base
Q	Metropolitan desegregation
R	Designing special programs to motivate and improve student performance
S	Implementing desegregation plans that include public and parochial schools

CODE	SOLUTIONS (continued)
T	State-wide urban education policy
U	Collaborative partnerships, involving diverse publics
V	An equal one-third funding partnership for urban schools by local, state, and federal agencies
W	Fiscal tax calendar adjustment
X	Designing fair and objective methods for assessing teacher performance
Y	Multi-party involvement in collective bargaining
Z	Multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula

CODE	RESOURCES
I	Local
I	State
III	Federal
IV	All three

TESTIFIERS BY GROUPS

PTA	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Bell, Artis, President, PTA Council of Baltimore County	18	K	I
2. Simms, Nathanial District of Columbia, Urban Service Commission	18	K, U	
3. Williams, Wilamina PTA President-Baltimore City	2	B, K, O	IV
BUSINESS			
1. Bowser, John, Exec. Dir., Philadelphia Urban Coalition	14, 15, 20	C, D	I
2. Bunting, John, Chairman, First Pennsylvania Bank	2, 4, 10	B, P	I
3. Koning, Hendrick B., Dir., High School Academy for Philadelphia Electric Company	6	W, U	I
4. Longstreth, Thacher, Pres., Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce	16, 17, 19	B, S, Y	IV
5. MacGregor, Robert, Pres., Chicago United	3, 11, 16	B, E, F, G	IV

BUSINESS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
6. Mingen, Elizabeth Chairperson of Legislation Phil. Pub. Sch. Nurses' Association	8		I, II
7. Rafsky, William, Pres., Center for Phil. Dev.	2, 9, 10	A, I, J, M	IV
8. Zaslow, Harry, Phil. Board of Realtors	1, 3	U	I
SCHOOL LEADERS			
1. Cox, Alex School Counselor	2, 4, 19	H, U	I
2. DiPilato, George Supt., Dist. 5, Phil. Sch. Dist.	2, 7, 24	L, R, V	IV
3. Fareira, John C., Natl. Assn. of Secondary Sch. Prin.	3, 9	R	I
4. Marcase, Dr. Michael Supt. of Sch. in Phil.	2, 4, 10	A, B, M	IV
5. Stack, Felice, Member, Phil. Bd. of Education	2, 10, 22	B, V	IV
STUDENTS			
1. Davis, Adriann, Student, West Phil. High School	4, 9, 18	K, R	I
2. Greenstein, Daniel, Student Univ. of Pennsylvania	9	R	
3. Williams, John, Student Overbrook High School	6, 18, 22		
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS			
1. Pearson, Andrea Area Manpower Planning Council, CETA	6	N	IV
TEACHERS			
1. Farmer, Marjorie, President Natl. Coun. of Teach. of Eng.	5, 9, 11	F, K, R	IV
LABOR LEADERS			
1. McGinley, Daniel, Pres. Phil. Assn. of Sch. Admn.	2, 6, 10	B, M, N, U	IV
2. O'Brien, Ronald, Asst. to St. Pres., Penn. Fed. of Teachers	2, 18	K, L, M	IV
COMMUNITY LEADERS			
1. Bowser, Charles, Attorney and Candidate for Mayor	14, 15, 20	C, D	I

COMMUNITY LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
2. D'Angiolini, Anemone, President, Women in Ed.	2, 4, 12	A, B, K, M, W	IV
3. Donovan, Randolph, Past-Pres., Home and Sch. Assn. Sayer and West Phil. Schs.	21	R	I
4. Fagan, Maurice B., Exec. Dir., Fellowship Commission	2, 10, 18	A, U	I, II
5. Fernandez, Happy, Co-Chairperson, Parents Union for Pub. Schs. in Phil.	12, 16, 18	K, U, Z	I
6. Gaber, Samuel L., Reg. Dir., Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith	13	Z	I
7. Gappert, Gary, Dir., Urban Dev., Research for Better Schools	9, 23	B, H, T	IV
8. Johnson, Elmore, Exec. Dir., Hartranft Comm. Corp.	9	L, R	I, III
9. McGregor, Peggy, Pres. Home & Sch. Assn., Houston School	12, 18, 22	K, U	I
10. Richardson, Nathalene Chairperson, Penn. Conf. on Black Basic Education	11	E, F	I
11. Showell, Beth, Education Comm. Phil. Assn. of Neighborhood Organization	2, 17, 18	K, M, U	
12. Swans, Jr., Bennie J., Dir., Crisis Intervention Network	1, 18	K, U	IV
13. Weiner, Debra, Citizens Comm. on Pub. Ed. in Phil.	2, 17, 18	A, Q, Y	IV
14. Williams, Janice, Pres. Phil. Home & Sch. Council	1, 2, 9	K, M	IV
CLERGY			
1. McCaskill, Rev. Randall First African Baptist Church	2, 18	B, K, U	IV
PARENTS/CITIZENS			
1. Arcurrie, Kathlene Child Psychologist	20	F	I
2. Leads, Roy, Resident Powelton Village	7, 8, 12	U	

COMMUNITY LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
3. Oakes, Helen, Editor *Oakes Newsletter*	2, 12, 16	B, K, U	I, II
4. Scheiner, Bella Citizen	3	R, X	

SUMMARY

Based on the most frequent or modal citations, the three major problems in Philadelphia were: (1) inadequate financial support of schools; (2) lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools; and (3) low academic achievement and poor student performance. The most popular solution offered by testifiers was that of greater parental involvement in the total educative process. The use of local resources was most often cited as either potential or actual in helping individuals or groups in their collaborations to solve problems identified in Philadelphia.

The number of testifiers and their citations are arrayed by their group interests and sex in Table I.

A brief analysis of the table reveals: business, school, labor, and community leaders cited inadequate financial support of schools more often than other groups. PTA and community leaders identified greater parental involvement more frequently as a solution; and business, school leaders, community leaders, and parents/citizens cited the use of local resources in dealing with the concerns in Philadelphia.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND SEX: PHILADELPHIA

GROUP	NO. OF TESTIFIERS	SEX	PROBLEM	SOLUTION	RESOURCE
PTA	3	Men-2 Women-1	18 •	K •	• •
Business	8	Men-7 Women-1	2, 3, 16 •	B •	I •
School Leaders	5	Men-4 Women-1	2 •	R •	I, IV •
Students	3	Men-2 Women-1	9, 18 •	R •	• •
Govt. Off.	1	Men-0 Women-1	• •	• •	• •

TABLE I (continued)

Teachers	1	Men-0 Women-1	• •	• •	• •
Labor Leaders	2	Men-2 Women-0	2 •	M •	IV •
Comm. Leaders	14	Men-7 Women-7	18 2, 18	R, U K	I I, IV
Clergy	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
Parents/ Citizens. . .	4	Men-1 Women-3	• 12	• U	• I
TOTALS	42	Men-26 Women-16			

• means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

B. SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

HEARING

The second in a series of national hearings by the National PTA on urban life and urban schools entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" was held in Seattle, January 16, 1979, at the Eames Theater, Pacific Science Center. For 11 hours, testimony was offered by 50 testifiers representing a cross-section of the Seattle community—civic leaders, high school students, clergy, school administrators, parents, business and labor leaders, elected officials, private citizens, and representatives of diverse community and educational groups.

PANEL MEMBERS

A panel of nine members representing the National PTA's Urban Advisory Task Force engaged in a process of listening and dialoguing with testifiers around issues and solutions that were most pressing to the testifiers. The panel members were: Virginia Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA; David Asai, Consultant, National PTA's Individual Development Commission; George Brown, Immediate Past Lieutenant Governor of Colorado and Vice-president, Marketing, Grumman Ecosystems Corporation;

Dr. John Dobbs, Assistant Superintendent, Michigan State University; Delores Gulledge, Teacher and Past President, Louisiana PTA; Barbara Scott, President, Washington PTSA; Dr. Leonard Valverde, Assistant Professor, Department of Educational Administration, University of Texas; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

CITED PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND RESOURCES

CODE	PROBLEMS
1	Crime, violence, vandalism
2	Inadequate financing of public education
3	Discipline
4	Inflation
5	Negative public attitudes about public education
6	General unemployment/Youth unemployment
7	Too much federal involvement in local schools
8	Decline of health and social services
9	Low academic achievement and poor student performance
10	White flight and the decline of urban tax base
11	Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators
12	Conflicts from political and self-interest groups
13	Racism
14	Financial overburden of urban school districts
15	School closing
16	Teacher unions and collective bargaining agreements
17	Desegregation
18	Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
19	Alienation of parents and students from school decision-making
20	Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
21	Teacher and administrator stress
22	Declining enrollments
23	Lack of sound compensatory or special education programs
24	Unrealistic expectations of school in a complex society
25	Lack of multi-cultural and multi-racial curricula and programs

CODE	PROBLEMS (continued)
26	Alcohol and drug abuse
27	Decaying school facilities
28	Inadequate housing

CODE	SOLUTIONS
A	Providing full state funding
B	Increasing federal funding
C	Designing comprehensive and preventive mental health programs
D	Developing drug education programs for students and school personnel
E	Providing systematic and compulsory management training for principals
F	Providing programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers
G	Developing plans for educational facility needs
H	Outlawing unionization of public employees
I	Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
J	Making education a national concern
K	Considering alternative methods of financing public education
L	Providing for student job training
M	Reorganizing school district
N	Establishing voluntary desegregation and busing programs
O	Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance
P	Adopting uniform discipline codes for students
Q	Establishing a state-wide urban education policy which includes an urban overburden factor
R	Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
S	Establishing mandatory desegregation and busing programs
T	Providing for PTA membership on all local school boards
U	Designing fair and objective methods for assessing teacher performance
V	Providing for multi-party involvement in collective bargaining
W	Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula

CODE	RESOURCES
I	Local
II	State
III	Federal
IV	Combined local, state, and federal
V	Group specific

TESTIFIERS BY GROUP

PTA	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Hanson, D., Vice-pres. of Ed., Seattle Council PTA	6, 9	L, O, Q	I, II
2. Jones, J., PTSA Spokane	6, 8, 14	Q	IV
3. Kemp, S., PTSA	8, 18	Q	IV
4. Malmgren, N., Pres. R. H. Thompson PTSA	11, 16, 19	R, U, V	I
5. Worth, M., Vice-pres., National PTA Region 7	3, 7, 23	B, O, R	IV
BUSINESS			
1. Frayn, M. Business—Printer/Publisher	2, 6, 10	K, L, O	I, II
2. Goodrich, E., King Co.	5, 12, 24	F, O, R	I
SCHOOL LEADERS			
1. Carmichael, D., Supt. Bellevue Public Schools	19, 20	I, O, R	I
2. Marum, R., Dr., Supt. Ed. Serv. Dist. 21	26	D	IV
3. Moberly, D., Dr. Supt. of Schools	14, 20	A, B, Q	I
4. Burton, W., Office for Equal Education -Dp I	13	R	I, II
STUDENTS			
1. Harmalla, A. Ingraham High School	3, 5, 19	O, R	I
2. Johnson, L., Stud.	20, 23	R, U	I
3. Spalding, C., Stud. Rainier Beach High School	17, 22, 15	R, W	I
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS			
1. Daley, B., Supt. of Public Instruction	14	Q	II

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS (cont.)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
2. Freeman, S., Office of Policy Planning	15, 22	Q	I, II
3. McBroom, J., District Planning Commission	4, 22, 27	G, R	I
4. Oki, A. Office of the Mayor	1, 20, 22	O, R, W	I
5. Royer, Mayor of Seattle	2, 6, 10	A, Q	IV
6. Spellman, J., County Exec.	2, 14	A, R	I, II
TEACHERS			
1. Green, L. Teacher, Ingraham High School	5, 15	O, R	I
2. Maloney, D., Arts Dept. Seattle Public Schools	21, 25	O, W	I
3. Spratlin, T., Dir., Dept. of Eco., Univ. of WA	10, 17, 28	S, W	I, II
LABOR LEADERS			
1. Coe, C., Pres., WA Teachers' Association	2, 20, 21	Q, R	I, II
2. Dugay, J., Pres., Prins. and Adms. Assoc. of Seattle Public Schools	2, 9, 14	O, Q	IV
3. Neuschwander, P., Pres. Seattle Teachers Assoc.	21, 23	A, Q, R	IV
4. Swift, L. (Statement from B. Marshall, Exec. Sec., WA State Sch. Dir. Assoc.)	16	A, V	I, II
COMMUNITY LEADERS			
1. Bullitt, J., National Comm. for Citizens in Education	2, 12, 18	I, R	I, V
2. Carlson, A., Chairperson Citizens for Fair Sch. Funding	2, 14	A, K, Q	I, II
3. Dehart, C. Jackson Park Tutoring	3, 9, 20	I, J, O	IV, V
4. Dickenson, D., Citizens Comm. for Acad. Excellence	2, 9, 14	O, Q, R	IV, V
5. Diederich, D., Federal Way	2, 12, 18	K, Q, R	I, II
6. Freeman, G., Chairman, Compens. Ed. Parent Adv. Comm.	17, 20, 23	B, F, Q	I, II

COMMUNITY LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
7. Gale, D., Citizens for Fair School Funding	2, 14, 20	Q	I, II
8. Hoptowit, J. Indian Heritage Program	13, 19	R	I
9. Ikeda, T. Atlantic Str. Cent.	9, 14, 25	J, Q, W	IV, V
10. Jason, H., Trouble Shooters	2, 23	B, O, Q	IV
11. Jellen, V., Citizens for Volunteer Integration	5, 17	N, O	I, II
12. Larson, B., Spec. Educational Advisory Comm.	9, 11, 14	E, F, Q	IV
13. Oh, T., Bilingual Education	3, 25	P, W	I
14. Page, J., Pres., Seattle Urban League	6, 9, 13	M, U, W	I
15. Sandvik, G. League of Women Voters	2, 14	A, O, R	II
16. Shoji, S., Japanese American Citizens' League	18, 25	R, W	I
17. Siqueland, A., Member of Dist. Adv. Comm. on Deseg.	22, 25	F, Q	I, II
18. Umlauff, S., Seattle and WA State Nurses' Assoc.	8, 14	C	I, II
19. Washburn, N., Citizens' Trans. Adv. Comm.	7, 20	T	I
CLERGY			
1. Cate, W., Rev., Pres., Dir. Church Council of Seattle	2, 20, 22	I, R	I
PARENTS/CITIZENS			
1. Locke, P., Taxpayer	7, 16	H	I
2. Norton, N.	8	B	V
3. Rogers, J., Parent, Nurse and Vol. in Health Room	8	C	I

SUMMARY

Based on the most frequent citations across the categories of Problems, Solutions, and Resources, the three major problems in Seattle were: (1) inadequate financing of public school education; (2) the financial overburden of urban school districts; and (3) the inability

of schools to meet the diverse needs of students. The most popular solution offered by the testifiers was that of establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students. A preponderant number of testifiers looked to local resources as either potential or actual in helping individuals or groups in their efforts to solve problems in Seattle. The combination of local and state resources was next in popularity.

The number of testifiers and their citations are arrayed by their group interests and sex in Table II.

TABLE II

NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND SEX: SEATTLE

GROUP	NO. OF TESTIFIERS	SEX	PROBLEM	SOLUTION	RESOURCE
PTA	5	Men-1 Women-4	• 8	• R	• IV
Business	2	Men-1 Women-1	• •	• •	• •
School Leaders	4	Men-4 Women-0	20 •	• •	I •
Students	3	Men-0 Women-3	• 22	• R	• I
Govt Off.	6	Men-4 Women-2	2, 14 22	Q R	II I
Teachers	3	Men-3 Women-0	• •	O, W •	I •
Labor Leaders	4	Men-3 Women-1	• •	A, Q •	IV •
Comm. Leaders	19	Men-8 Women-11	9 14	Q, R Q	I I
Clergy	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
Parents/ Citizens	3	Men-1 Women-2	• 8	• •	• I
TOTALS	50	Men-26 Women-24			

• means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

A brief analysis of the table reveals: the mentioning of the inadequate financing of public schools was rather evenly distributed among the groups in Seattle, with the notable exceptions of the PTA, school leaders, students, and parents/citizens; the use of collaborative partnerships in dealing with urban problems was most often cited by the PTA, students, government officials, and community leaders; and the use of local resources was popular with most groups, with the exceptions being the PTA, government officials, and labor leaders.

C. HOUSTON, TEXAS

HEARING

The third in a series of national hearings by the National PTA on urban life and urban schools entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" was held in Houston, February 6, 1979, at Texas Southern University, in the School of Education Building, 3201 Wheeler Street. From 10:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., testimony was presented by 30 testifiers representing the diversity of the Houston community—civic leaders, college students, clergy, school and university administrators, parents, business and labor leaders, elected officials, private citizens, and representatives of diverse community and educational groups.

PANEL MEMBERS

A panel of nine members representing the National PTA's Urban Advisory Task Force engaged in a process of listening and dialoguing with testifiers. The panel members were: Grace Baisinger, then President, National PTA; George Brown, Immediate Past Lieutenant Governor of Colorado and Vice-president, Marketing, Grumman Ecosystems Corporation; Dr. Angeline Caruso, Associate Superintendent of Schools, Chicago Public Schools; Jean Dye, Vice-president for Legislative Activity, National PTA; Dr. Walter C. Farrell, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Community Education, University of Wisconsin; Dr. Val Flores, Assistant Professor, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of Texas; Hester Herbster, President, Texas PTA; Virginia V. Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

43

CITED PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND RESOURCES

CODE	PROBLEMS
1	Crime, violence, vandalism
2	Inadequate financing of public education
3	Discipline
4	Inflation
5	Negative public attitudes about public education
6	General unemployment/Youth unemployment
7	Too much federal involvement in local schools
8	Decline of health and social services
9	Low academic achievement and poor student performance
10	White/black flight and the decline of urban tax base
11	Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators
12	Conflicts from political and self-interest groups
13	Absenteeism
14	Financial overburden of urban school districts
15	Adolescent pregnancy
16	Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
17	Alienation of parents and students from school decision-making
18	Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
19	Unrealistic expectations of school in a complex society
20	Lack of multi-cultural and multi-racial curricula and programs
21	Decaying physical facilities
22	Inadequate housing

CODE	SOLUTIONS
A	Providing full state funding
B	Increasing federal funding
C	Designing comprehensive and preventive mental health programs
D	Developing parenting centers
E	Establishing a "Marshall Plan" for urban schools

CODE	SOLUTIONS (continued)
F	Providing programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers
G	Continuing annexation authority of municipal government
H	Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
I	Making education a national concern
J	Considering alternative methods of financing public education
K	Providing for student job training
L	Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance
M	Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
N	Re-establishing neighborhood schools
O	Determining optimum size of a school district
P	Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula

CODE	RESOURCES
I	Local
II	State
III	Federal
IV	Combined local, state, and federal
V	Group specific

TESTIFIERS BY GROUP

PTA	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Blissard, Katherine Vice-pres., Regn. V, Texas PTA	1, 13, 16	H	III
*2. Delaney, Marvin C. Chairman-Credentials/Pub. Houston City Council PTA	16	H, J	IV
3. Dennis, Mrs. Howard, Pres. Spring Branch Council PTA	16, 17	K, L	I
4. Viola, Mrs. Frank, Pres. Westbury PTA	1, 2, 3	A, H	I, II
5. Wernick, Mrs. David, Local Unit PTA Pres., 1st Vice-pres., Harris PTA	2, 4, 7	A, N	I
6. Wright, Mrs. Jo Paul. Pres. Houston City Council PTA	16, 13, 15	M, D	I

BUSINESS	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Welch, Louis, Pres. Houston Chamber of Commerce	2, 10	M, G	I, II
SCHOOL LEADERS			
1. Gaines, Jr., Arthur M. Deputy Supt., Area IV	10, 17	M, P	I
2. Jones, J. B., Dean, Texas Southern University	3, 5, 11	F, I, P	IV, V
3. Ligons, Dr. C. Merrell Urban Ed., Texas Southern Univ.	11, 18, 20	F, L, P	IV, V
4. Merrill, Dr. Joseph, Prof., Dept. of Comm. Medicine, Baylor College of Medicine	16	C, H, K	I
*5. Quintanilla, Guadalupe Asst. Provost to Undergraduate Student	5, 18, 20	P	I
6. Reagan, Billy, Supt., Houston Independent Sch. Dist.	13, 18, 19	H, M	I, V
7. Schwartz, Carl J., Board Mem., Pasadena Indp. Sch. Bd.	3, 9, 12	B, H, J	I, II
*8. Shell, Patricia, Deputy Supt. for Special Services Houston Independent Sch. Dist.	16, 18	M	IV
9. Tapscott, Dr. E. V., Dean, Houston Baptist University	2, 10	M, O	I
10. Tatum, Dr. Charles E., Prof., The Urban Resources Center, Texas Southern University	1, 5, 20	H, M	I, V
STUDENTS			
1. Murphy, Hortense M. Student Teacher, T.S.U.	11, 18	H, M, P	I
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS			
1. Hare, Bill, Photographer, Houston Police Department	2, 4, 16	H, L	I, V
2. Neumeyer, Florence Exec. Assistant to the Mayor	10, 21, 22	K, M	IV, V
3. Strehle, Joseph, Dir. of Dev. & Res., Region IV, Education Service Center	16, 17, 18	H, K, D	IV, V

* Not local resident

TEACHERS	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
(No teachers testified at Houston hearing)			
LABOR LEADERS			
1. Blackman, Sam, Uniserv Consultant, Texas State Teachers' Assoc.	1, 11, 16	B, I, M	IV, V
COMMUNITY LEADERS			
1. Byrd, Betty, Program Coordinator, March of Dimes	5, 13, 16	H, M, D	I, V
2. Byrd, Nancy, M.D., Harris County Medical Society	8, 14	C	IV
3. Naber, George A., Operation Breadbasket	3, 16, 18	H, M	IV
4. Rutledge, Mary, March of Dimes	15, 16	H, D	IV, V
CLERGY			
1. Sampson, Rev. A. W., Pastor, Hopewell Baptist Church	16	H, M	I
PARENTS/CITIZENS			
1. Collier, Herbert, Community Volunteer Delegate, Langston Elem. Sch.	15, 16	D, E	I
2. Osborne, Mrs. Rafe	5, 6, 8	H, J, P	IV
3. Peiffer, Bobby Ann, Parent	5, 13, 19	H, J, D	IV

SUMMARY

Based on the most frequent citations across the categories of problems, solutions, and resources by the 30 testifiers, the three major problems in Houston were: (1) lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools; (2) the inability of schools to meet the diverse needs of students; and (3) negative public attitudes about public education. Ensuring more parental involvement in the total educative process was the most popular solution offered.

A preponderant number of testifiers looked to local resources as either potential or actual in helping individuals or groups in their efforts to solve problems in Houston. The combination of local and/or combined resources, with group-specific resources, was next in popularity.

The number of testifiers and their citations are arrayed by their group interests and sex in Table III.

A brief analysis of the table reveals: PTA and community leaders cited most often the lack of parental or broad-based community participation as a problem in Houston; the PTA, school leaders, government officials, community leaders, parents, and citizens mentioned more often the solution of ensuring more parental involvement in the total educative process; the PTA and school leaders seek local resources more often in dealing with their problems in Houston.

TABLE III
NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND SEX: HOUSTON

GROUP	NO. OF TESTIFIERS	SEX	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
PTA	6	Men-1 Women-5	• 16	• A, H	• I
Business	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
School Leaders	10	Men-8 Women-2	3, 5, 10, 11, 18, 20 18	H, P, M •	I •
Student	1	Men-0 Women-1	• •	• •	• •
Govt. Off.	3	Men-2 Women-1	16 •	H •	V •
Teachers	0				
Labor Leaders	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
Comm. Leaders	4	Men-1 Women-3	• 16	• D, H	• IV, V
Clergy	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
Parents/ Citizens	3	Men-1 Women-2	• 5	• H, J	• IV
TOTALS	30	Men-16 Women-14			

• means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

D. MIAMI, FLORIDA

HEARING

The fourth in a series of national hearings by the National PTA on urban life and urban schools entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We Do for Our Schools?" was held in Houston, February 20, 1979, at the Lindsay Hopkins Building of the Dade County School System, in the School of Education Building, 1410 Northeast Second Avenue. For ten hours, testimony was presented by 40 testifiers representing the diversity of the Miami community—civic leaders, high school students, clergy, school and university administrators, teachers, parents, business and labor leaders, elected officials, private citizens, and representatives of diverse community and educational groups.

PANEL MEMBERS

A panel of nine members representing the National PTA's Urban Advisory Task Force engaged in a process of listening and dialoguing with testifiers. The panel members were: Grace Baisinger, then President, National PTA; George Brown, Immediate Past Lt. Gov. of Colorado and Vice-president, Marketing, Grumman Ecosystems Corporation; Dr. Arthur Jefferson, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit Public Schools; Doris Leftakes, Past President, Chicago Region PTA; Milton Bins, Senior Associate, Council of Great City Schools, University of Wisconsin; Dr. John Dobbs, Assistant Superintendent, State Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan; Joanne House, President, Florida PTA; Virginia V. Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

CITED PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND RESOURCES

CODE	PROBLEMS
1	Crime, violence, vandalism
2	Inadequate financing of public education
3	Discipline
4	Inflation
5	Negative public attitudes about public education

CODE	PROBLEMS (continued)
6	General unemployment/Youth unemployment
7	Too much federal involvement in local schools
8	Decline of health and social services
9	Low academic achievement and poor student performance
10	White flight and the decline of urban tax base
11	Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators
12	Inability of society to properly rehabilitate juvenile criminals
13	Racism
14	Financial overburden of urban school districts
15	Adolescent pregnancy
16	Teacher unions and collective bargaining agreements
17	Desegregation
18	Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
19	Alienation of parents and students from school decision-making
20	Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
21	Teacher and administrator stress
22	Declining enrollments
23	Lack of sound compensatory or special education programs
24	Unrealistic expectations of a school in a complex society
25	Lack of multi-cultural and multi-racial curricula and programs
26	Alcohol and drug abuse
27	Absenteeism
28	Inadequate housing
29	Large class sizes

CODE	SOLUTIONS
A	Providing for full or increased state funding
B	Increasing federal funding
C	Designing comprehensive and preventive mental health programs
D	Developing drug education programs for students and personnel
E	Reducing the age at which a juvenile offender could be treated as an adult

CODE	SOLUTIONS (continued)
F	Providing programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers
G	Designing compensatory education programs for low income youth
H	Outlawing unionization of public education
I	Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
J	Reducing class sizes
K	Considering alternative methods of financing public education
L	Providing for student job training
M	Reorganizing school districts into learning and governance clusters
N	Establishing a local monitoring agency of parents to hold schools accountable for student performance
O	Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance
P	Establishing parenting centers
Q	Establishing a state and federal urban education policy which includes an urban overburden factor
R	Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
S	Returning to neighborhood schools for the use of public facilities and personnel on a 24-hour basis
T	Designing fair and objective methods for assessing teacher performance
U	Providing for multi-party involvement in collective bargaining
V	Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula
W	Providing for municipal backed mortgages for low and middle income groups

CODE	RESOURCES
I	Local
II	State
III	Federal
IV	Combined local, state, and federal
V	Group specific

TESTIFIERS BY GROUPS

PTA	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Enright, Ella, Pres., Sylvania Heights Elem. PTA	19	I, R	I
2. Okasako, Marge, Pres., Dade County Council PTA/PTSA	2, 29	A, Q, R	IV
BUSINESS			
1. Blanco, Robert Gonzalez Republic Natl. Bank of Miami	3	L, O, R	I, V
2. Lepeska, Richard, Exec. Vice-pres., South Florida Coordinating Council	9, 11, 18	A, I, T	I, II
3. Long, James A., Manager, Personnel Development, Storer Broadcasting Co.	6	F, L	I
SCHOOL LEADERS			
1. Britton, Dr. Leonard, Deputy Supt., Dade County Public Schools	2, 4, 14	A, B, Q	IV
2. Fain, Stephen M., Assoc. Prof., Florida Int. University	5, 11, 24	F, M, R	IV
3. Jones, Dr. J. L., Supt., Dade County Pub. Schools	2,14,22	A, K, R	IV, V
4. Lorton, Dr. Eveleen, Prof. of Ed., Univ. of Miami	11	F, T	IV, V
5. Masiko, Jr., Peter, Pres., Miami-Dade Comm. College	6, 18	I, L, O	IV, V
6. Miller, Phyllis, Chmn., Dade County School Board	18, 19, 22	I, Q, R	IV, V
7. Okles, Alan T., Pres., Dade County Sch. Adm. Assoc.	5, 24	R	I
8. Rivas, Eddie Suarez, M.A., Ed. Spec., Mercy College	6, 9	O	I, V
9. Wheatley, Russ, Prin., Hialeah, Miami Lakes Senior High School	26, 27	D, R	I, V
10. Zahner, Dr. Carl, Asst. Prof. of Ed., Barry College	19, 29	I, J, M	I
STUDENTS			
1. Givens, Jr., Horace, Stud. Pres., Miami Edison Senior High School	3, 6, 9	I, O	I

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Gilbert, Jr., James P., Fire Inspector, Miami Fire Dept.	23	L	I
2. Harms, Kenneth Chief of Police, Miami Police Department	1, 3, 18	P, R	IV, V
3. Marchner, Russ, Exec. Dir., Dade League of Cities, Inc.	1, 7, 12	E, T	I, II, V
4. Shack, Ruth, County Comm., Metro. Dade County Govt.	2, 5	R	IV
5. Young, Rep. Walter, Chmn., House Education Committee	2, 9	A, K	IV
TEACHERS			
1. Burkholz, Yvonne, Dir. of Govt. Relations, United Teachers of Dade	5, 9, 23	G, J, K	IV
LABOR LEADERS			
(No labor leaders testified at this hearing)			
COMMUNITY LEADERS			
1. Beckford, Ethel F. Vice-president Community Action Agency	11, 14, 16	F, Q, U	IV
2. Due, Patricia, Pres., Dade County Title I Parent Advisory Council	2, 13, 25	J, O, T	IV
3. Flanagan, Joyce, Chmn., Citizens' Advisory Committee, North Area Region II	2, 14, 18	A, B, Q	IV
4. Gordon, The Rev. Howard, Co-Chmn., Coalition for Support of Education	2, 9, 14	A, J, Q	IV, V
5. Hinson, M. F., Chmn., North Area Region I, Citizen Advisory Committee	1, 3, 11	I, L, S	IV
6. Kaplan, Betsy, Cultural Arts & Educational Media	20	O	I, V
7. Kruse, Ruth, Chmn., Dade County Youth Advisory Board	1, 8, 15	A, C	IV

COMMUNITY LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
8. Mendez, Jose R., Coordinator, Puerto Rican Opp. Cent., Inc.	13, 25	I, K, V	IV
9. Orth, Paul, Chmn., Region II, South Area Citizens Advisory Committee	2, 7, 24	A, I, V	I, II
10. Rifkin, Selma L., Chmn., South Central Area Advisory Committee	2, 3, 4	A, I, R	I, II, V
CLERGY			
1. Graham, Edward T., Retired Baptist Minister	6, 11, 28	F, T, W	I
2. McCarthy, Archbishop, Archdiocese of Miami	6, 8	I, M, N	IV
PARENTS/CITIZENS			
1. Bowens, Alice J., Parent Worker, Earlington Heights	2	I, Q, R	IV, V
2. Finkelstein, Marilyn School Social Worker	1, 2, 19	C, I, K	IV, V
3. Griener, Gene, Poet, Dade County Sch. Vol. Program	29	A, B, J	IV
4. Murfin, Dr. Mark	2, 3, 16	H, M, R	IV
5. Storr, Ronald T., Citizen	19	R	I
6. Zuckerman, LaVona R., Citizen	9, 23, 25	G, V	IV

SUMMARY

Based on the most frequent citations across the categories of problems, solutions, and resources by the 40 testifiers, the three major problems in Miami were: (1) inadequate financing for public education; (2) low academic achievement and poor student performance; and (3) a tie between discipline, and the inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators. Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students was the most popular solution offered.

The combination of local, federal, and state resources in helping individuals or groups in dealing with the above problems was cited by the majority of testifiers. Group specific resources was next in popularity.

The number of testifiers and their citations are arrayed by their group interests and sex in Table IV.

A brief analysis of the table reveals: Inadequate financing of public school education was most frequently cited by school community leaders and parent/citizen groups; PTA members, school leaders, parents, and citizens offered collaborative partnerships as the solution to their view of the problems in Miami; and the majority of groups looked to the combination of local, federal, and state resources to help ameliorate the problems cited.

TABLE IV

NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND SEX: MIAMI

GROUP	NO. OF TESTIFIERS	SEX	PROBLEM	SOLUTION	RESOURCE
PTA	2	Men-0 Women-2	• •	• R	• •
Business	3	Men-3 Women-0	• •	• •	I •
School Leaders	10	Men-8 Women-2	2,5,6,14 •	R •	I, IV, V IV, V
Students	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
Govt. Off.	5	Men-4 Women-1	1 •	• •	I, IV, V •
Teachers	1	Men-0 Women-1	• •	• •	• •
Labor Leaders	0				
Comm. Leaders	10	Men-4 Women-6	2 2	I A	IV IV
Clergy	2	Men-2 Women-0	6	•	•
Parents/ Citizens	6	Men-3 Women-3	• 2	R I	IV IV
TOTALS	40	Men-25 Women-15			

• means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

E. KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI HEARING

The fifth in a series of national hearings by the National PTA on urban life and urban schools entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" was held in Kansas City, Missouri, March 6, 1979, at the Board of Education Auditorium, Kansas City School System, 1211 McGee.

From 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., testimony was presented by 39 testifiers representing the diversity of the Kansas City community—civic leaders, high school students, clergy, school and university administrators, teachers, parents, business and labor leaders, elected officials, private citizens, representatives of diverse community and educational groups.

PANEL MEMBERS

A panel of 11 members representing the National PTA's Urban Advisory Task Force engaged in a process of listening and dialoguing with testifiers. The panel members were: Grace Baisinger, then President, National PTA; George Brown, Immediate Past Lt. Gov. of Colorado and Vice-president, Marketing, Grumman Ecosystems Corporation; Dr. Angeline Caruso, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools; Doris Leftakes, Past President, Chicago Region PTA; Dr. Walter Farrell, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Community Education, University of Wisconsin; Dr. John Dobbs, Assistant Superintendent, State Department of Education, Lansing, Michigan; Clarice Seals, then President, Missouri PTA; Virginia V. Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA; Edna Polin, Vice-president, Region 1, National PTA; David Asai, Consultant, National PTA's Individual Development Commission; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

CITED PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND RESOURCES

CODE	PROBLEMS
1	Crime, violence, vandalism
2	Inadequate financing of public education
3	Discipline
4	Inflation

CODE	PROBLEMS (continued)
5	Negative public attitudes about public education
6	General unemployment/Youth unemployment
7	Too many federal and state mandated programs
8	Decline of health and social services
9	Low academic achievement and poor student performance
10	White flight and the decline of urban tax base
11	Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators
12	Erosion of biblical mores
13	Segregation, desegregation, re-segregation
14	Financial overburden of urban school districts
15	Adolescent pregnancy
16	Teacher unions and collective bargaining agreements
17	Too many fragmented school districts
18	Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
19	Alienation of parents and students from school decision-making
20	Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
21	Conflicts among and between political and self-interest groups
22	Waste and deceptions in school budgets
23	Lack of sound compensatory or special education programs
24	Unrealistic expectations of school in a complex society
25	Lack of multi-cultural and multi-racial curricula and programs
26	Alcohol and drug abuse
27	Absenteeism
28	Inadequate housing
29	Large class sizes

CODE	SOLUTIONS
A	Providing for full or increased state funding
B	Increasing federal funding
C	Designing comprehensive staff and organizational development programs
D	Consolidating fragmented school districts
E	Returning to biblical teachings and precepts
F	Providing programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers and administrators

CODE	SOLUTIONS (continued)
G	Designing compensatory education programs for low income youth
H	Implementing a "Push for Excellence" program
I	Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
J	Modifying or eliminating "Planned Parenthood" programs
K	Considering alternative methods of financing public education
L	Providing for student job training
M	Creating federal child care legislation
N	Implementing "humanistic programs with structure and discipline"
O	Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance
P	Insuring longer tenure for superintendent and board members
Q	Establishing a state and federal urban education policy which includes an urban overburden factor
R	Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
S	Returning to neighborhood schools for the use of public facilities and personnel on a 24-hour basis
T	Designing fair and objective methods for assessing teacher performance
U	Reducing class sizes
V	Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula
W	Reducing waste and size of schools

CODE	RESOURCES
I	Local
II	State
III	Federal
IV	Combined local, state, and federal
V	Group specific

TESTIFIERS BY GROUPS

PTA	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Holmes, Sherry, Pres., Shawnee Mission Area Council PTA	18	I, R	I

PTA (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
2. King, Judith S., Council Pres., Oklahoma City PTA	5, 10, 27	I, L, R	I, V
3. Kubier, Kathleen, Council Secretary, Oklahoma City PTA	5, 10, 27	I, L, R	IV
4. Scheetz, Ruth, First Vice-pres., Missouri PTA	2, 5, 18	A, I, R	IV
5. Walthall, Judy, Pres., Southwest High School PTA	2, 13, 28	F, K, I	IV
BUSINESS			
1. Dorsey, Claude, Vice-pres., KMBC-TV	1, 3, 5	H	I
2. Louise, Sister Olive, Pres., Women's Chamber of Commerce, Avila College	3, 11, 18	F, I, R	I
3. Penn, Percy J., Dir., Land Development, Black Economic Union	6, 20	R	I
4. Powell, Marjory, Powell Family Foundation	19	I, R	I
SCHOOL LEADERS			
1. Ball, Dr. Arzell, Supt., Shawnee Mission Public Schools	2, 4, 24	A, K, O	IV
2. Davern, The Rev. Raymond J., President, Donnelly College	3, 9, 11	B, L, Q	IV
3. Greim, Mary R., Retired Teachers' Association	11, 18, 20	F, I, R	I, V
4. Jackard, Dr. Charles, Prin., Alternate School and TAMS Program	3, 26, 27	N, O	V
5. Levine, Dr. Daniel U., Prof. of Ed., Univ. of Missouri, Kansas City	3, 6, 9	C, F	V
6. Olson, Michael, Pres., Lincoln Academy	11, 20, 23	F, L, O	I, V
7. Osgood, Paul, Pres., NEA-Shawnee Mission Office	2, 5, 7	K, R	IV
8. Plucker, Dr. O. L., Supt., Unified School Dist. #500, Kansas City, Kansas	7, 14, 28	Q, R	IV
9. Robb, Nina, Exec. Dir., Head Start, Banneker School	23	M, O	IV, V

SCHOOL LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
10. Ross, Sue, Van Horn School Student Advisory Committee	9, 18	R	I
11. Scoville, Mrs. R. W., Board of Education Dist. #500, Kansas City, KS	5, 18, 24	O, R	I, V
12. Waier, Dr. Raymond D., Supt., North Kansas City School Dist. #74	5, 9, 21	P, R, S	IV
13. Wheeler, Dr. Robert R., Supt., Kansas City, Missouri School District	2, 9, 14	K, R	IV
STUDENTS			
1. Devauce, Donita, Student, Lincoln Academy	11, 20, 23	F, L, O	I, V
2. Gilbert, Robert J., Student Rep., Shawnee Mission East High School PTA	19	O	I
3. White, Melinda Student, Lincoln Academy	11, 20, 23	F, L, O	I, V
GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS			
1. Wheeler, Jr., Dr., Charles B., Mayor of Kansas City, Missouri	2, 17, 18	D, K	IV
TEACHERS			
(No teachers testified at this hearing)			
LABOR LEADERS			
(No labor leaders testified at this hearing)			
COMMUNITY LEADERS			
1. Frech, Frances, Dir., Population Renewal Office	15	J	IV, V
2. Harris, Zelma, First Vice-pres., NAACP	9, 23, 25	F, I, V	IV
3. Makovsky, Donald, Exec. Dir., Jewish Ed. Coun. of Greater Kansas City	9, 29	O, U	I
4. McDonough, John, Pres., Taxpayers' Defense League	22	W	I

COMMUNITY LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
5. Nero, Richard L., Chairman, Title I Parents' Advisory Council	3, 5, 18	I, F, T	IV, V
6. Powell, Bernard, Pres., Social Action Committee of Twenty	19, 20	H, R	I
7. Reitjes, Mary Louise, Pro-Family Forum	12, 15	E, J	IV, V
8. Stanley, Mary Jane, Pro-Family Forum	9, 12	E	I
9. Stovall, Mrs. Ashton, Project Director, Education Task Force	3, 5, 13	R	I
10. Walter, Madaline, Exec. Dir., Council on Education	20	L, O, R	I, V
CLERGY			
1. Williams, Dr. John W., Pastor St. Stephen's Baptist Church	9, 11	F, H, O	I
PARENTS/CITIZENS			
1. Burris, Darlene	12	E	I
2. Margraft, Dorothy	21	I, R	I

SUMMARY

Based on the most frequent citations across the categories of problems, solutions, and resources by the 39 testifiers, the three major problems in Kansas City were: (1) a tie between negative public attitudes about public education and low academic achievement and poor student performance; and (2) a lack of parental or broad-based community participation and the inadequate preparation in schools. Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students was the most popular solution offered.

A reliance on local resources in helping individuals or groups in dealing with the above problems was cited by the majority of testifiers.

The number of testifiers and their citations are arrayed by their group interests and sex in Table V.

A brief analysis of the table reveals: The groups citing the problems of negative public attitudes about public education, and/or low academic achievement and poor student performance, were

84

PTA members and school /community leaders; the popularity of using collaborative partnerships in resolving problems in Kansas City was shared by business and school/community groups; and business, school, student, community, and parents/citizens' groups represented the majority of groups who looked to local resources in dealing with their concerns.

TABLE V

NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND SEX: KANSAS CITY

GROUP	NO. OF TESTIFIERS	SEX	PROBLEM	SOLUTION	RESOURCE
PTA	5	Men-0 Women-5	• 5	• I	• IV
Business	4	Men-2 Women-2	• •	• I, R	I I
School Leaders	13	Men-9 Women-4	9 18	R R	IV I, V
Students	3	Men-1 Women-2	• 11, 20, 23	• F, L, O	• I, V
Govt.	1	Men-1 Women-0	•	•	•
Teachers	0				
Labor Leaders	0				
Comm. Leaders	10	Men-4 Women-6	• 9, 12, 15	• E, J, R	I I, IV, V
Clergy	1	Men-1 Women-0	• •	• •	• •
Parents/ Citizens	2	Men-0 Women-2	• •	• •	• I
TOTALS	39	Men-18 Women-21			

• means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

F. DETROIT, MICHIGAN

HEARING

The sixth and last in a series of national hearings by the National PTA on urban life and urban schools entitled "The PTA Challenges the Cities: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" was held in Detroit, March 20, 1979, at the Conference Center for the Detroit Public School System, School Center Building, 5057 Woodward. For ten hours, testimony was presented by 45 testifiers representing a cross-section of the Detroit community—civic leaders, high school students, clergy, school and university administrators, teachers, parents, business and labor leaders, elected officials, private citizens, and representatives of diverse community and educational groups.

PANEL MEMBERS

A panel of ten members representing the National PTA's Urban Advisory Task Force engaged in a process of listening and dialoguing with testifiers. The panel members were: Grace Baisinger, then President, National PTA; George Brown, Immediate Past Lt. Governor of Colorado and Vice-president, Marketing, Grumman Ecosystems Corporation; Dr. Ruth Love, Superintendent of Schools, Oakland, California; Dr. Clyde C. Gehrig, then President, Michigan PTSA; Milton Bins, Senior Associate, Council of Great City Schools, Washington, D.C.; Kathryn J. Moses, Acting Director of Urban Initiatives, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.; Dr. Keith Goldhammer, Dean of Education, Michigan State University; Virginia V. Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA; Dr. David Stratman, then Director of Governmental Relations, National PTA's Washington (D.C.) Office; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

CITED PROBLEMS, SOLUTIONS, AND RESOURCES

CODE	PROBLEMS
1	Crime, violence, vandalism
2	Inadequate financing of public education
3	Discipline
4	Inflation

CODE	PROBLEMS (continued)
5	Negative public attitudes about public education
6	General unemployment/Youth unemployment
7	Too much federal involvement in local schools
8	Decline of health and social services
9	Low academic achievement and poor student performance
10	White flight and the decline of urban tax base
11	Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators
12	Lack of uniform spelling programs
13	Racism
14	Financial overburden of urban school districts
15	Adolescent pregnancy
16	Teacher unions and collective bargaining agreements
17	Segregation/Desegregation
18	Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
19	Alienation of parents and students from school decision-making
20	Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
21	Conflicts among and between political and self-interest groups
22	Declining enrollments
23	Lack of sound compensatory or special education programs
24	Unrealistic expectations of school in a complex society
25	Lack of multi-cultural and multi-racial curricula and programs
26	Alcohol and drug abuse
27	Absenteeism
28	Sex and violence on TV
29	Large class sizes

CODE	SOLUTIONS
A	Providing for full or increased state funding
B	Increasing federal funding
C	Designing comprehensive and preventive mental health programs
D	Putting community pressure on FCC licensing or local networks
E	Implementing a "Marshall Plan" for urban high schools
F	Providing programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers and administrators

CODE	SOLUTIONS (continued)
G	Implementing a "Push for Excellence" program
H	Implementing "Better Education Through Spelling" project
I	Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
J	Reducing class sizes
K	Considering alternative methods of financing public education
L	Providing for student job training
M	Expanding programs like "The Continuing Education Program for Girls"
N	Establishing a local monitoring agency of parents to hold schools accountable for student performance
O	Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance
P	Establishing parenting centers
Q	Establishing a state and federal urban education policy which includes an urban overburden factor
R	Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
S	Providing for more adequate programs for the handicapped
T	Designing fair and objective methods for assessing teacher performance
U	Developing mandatory drug education programs for students and school personnel
V	Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula

CODE	RESOURCES
I	Local
II	State
III	Federal
IV	Combined local, state, and federal
V	Group specific

TESTIFIERS BY GROUPS

PTA	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Brand, Mary E., Pres., Detroit Council of PTAs	15, 29	J, M, R	IV
2. Ernst, Connie, Vice-pres., Michigan PTSA	18	I, R	I
*3. Ricketts, Nancy K., Past Pres., Utica (Michigan) PTA Council			

BUSINESS	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Doss, Lawrence P. Coopers & Lybrand	9, 11, 14	R, T	IV
2. Edgecomb, Diane J., Pres., Central Business Dist. Assoc.	28	I, D	I
3. Palmer, Dr. Frances H., Pres., Merrill-Palmer Institute	18, 20, 23	I, P	IV, V
4. Saltzman, Arthur, Exec. Dir., Greater Detroit Chamber of Commerce	6	L, R	I
SCHOOL LEADERS			
1. Baker, Robert, Pres., Organization of School Administrators & Supervisors	1, 2, 9	F	IV
2. Bell, George, Pres., Central Board of Education	2, 5, 6	L, O, V	IV
3. Citron, Dr. Abraham, Prof. of Education, Wayne State University	12	H	I
4. Greene, Dr. Marvin, Asst. Superintendent, Detroit Public Schools	19, 20, 24	R	I
5. Gretchko, Dr. Seymour, Supt., Region 6, Detroit Public Schools	5, 16, 21	R	I
6. Jefferson, Dr. Arthur, Gen. Supt., Detroit Public Schools	2, 5, 18	A, I, R	IV
7. Simpkins, Dr. Edward, Dean, College of Education Wayne State University	11, 15, 17	F, I, P	IV, V
8. Williams, Herbert, Princ., Woodward School	18, 23	E, R	IV
STUDENTS			
1. Gause, Ella, Student, Metro. Detroit Youth Fdn.	1, 3, 27	O	V
2. Moon, Mary, Student, Wayne State University	6, 23	L, O, R	I
3. Smith, Brian, Student, Clipper-Middle School PTSA	9, 19, 20	O, T	I
4. Tisdale, James, Student, Metro. Detroit Youth Fdn.	19, 25	O	I
5. Wilson, Anthony, Student, Clipper-Middle School PTSA	19, 20	R	I

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
1. Bryant, Agnes H., Dir., Human Rights Dept., City of Detroit	10, 14, 23	A, Q, R	IV
2. Douglas, Arletta, Exec. Asst. to the Mayor, Detroit Mayor's Office	6, 13, 20	L, R	IV, V
3. Faxon, The Hon. Jack, Chmn., Senate Education Committee	2, 14	A, K	I, II
4. Butler, Michelle, Student Council Pres., Call Tech. High School	1, 3, 19	I, R	I
TEACHERS			
(No teachers testified at this hearing.)			
LABOR LEADERS			
(No labor leaders testified at this hearing.)			
COMMUNITY LEADERS			
*1. Arcand, Robert, Asst. Dir., Greater Detroit Roundtable, Natl. Conf. of Christians and Jews			
2. Coverson, The Rev. Robert J., Pres., Operation PUSH (Metro-Detroit)	1, 2, 3	G, P, T	IV, V
3. Douglas, Walter, Pres., New Detroit, Inc.	2, 11, 20	F, K, Q	IV, V
4. Frisch, Carol, Pres., League of Women Voters of Detroit	6	K, L, R	IV, V
5. Gibson, Jr., Dennis L., Executive Director, Metro. Detroit Youth Fdn.	6, 9	R	IV
*6. Goodwin, Dr. Jesse F., Second Vice-Pres., Education Commission Chairman			
7. Gray, Dr. Elisha Delbert, Dir., Detroit Pre-Employment Training Center	6, 10	L, R	IV, V
8. de la Isla, Jamie, Chairperson, City Wide Bilingual/Bicultural Education Advisory Comm.	2, 20, 25	B, I, V	IV

COMMUNITY LEADERS (continued)	PROBLEMS	SOLUTIONS	RESOURCES
9. Kubat, Melba, Parent, Michigan Assoc. for Children with Learning Disabilities	23	S	IV
*10. Love, Josephine, Co-Director, Your Heritage House			
11. Moore, Helen, Spokeswoman for Black Parents for Quality Education	13, 20	I, O, V	I
12. Muhammad, Salahuddin, Vice-Chairperson, Michigan Anti-Drug Coalition	18, 26	J, N, U	IV, V
13. McPherson, Alfred H., Manager, Staff Training and Dev., Chrysler Corp.	1, 6	F, G, L	IV, V
14. O'Hare, Fay, Chairperson, Citizens' Monitoring Comm.	3, 5, 9	I, L, O	I
15. Peek, V. Lonnie, Chairman of Board, Concerned Citizens' Council, Inc.	1	C, L, O	I, V
16. Robinson, Dr. Phyllis E., Chairperson, Girl Scouts of Metro-Detroit	1, 9, 19	I, O, R	IV
17. Schonenberg, Frances L., Education Representative, American Association of University Women	6, 10, 21	I, R	I, E, V
18. Sklenar, Jan B., Chairman, Committee of Slavic Educators	13, 21	R	I
19. Wadsworth, The Rev. James, Chmn., Superintendent's Adv. Comm. on Sch. Desegregation	18	I, R	I

CLERGY			
(No clergymen testified at this hearing.)			

PARENTS/CITIZENS			
1. Black, Bill Reporter, WJR Radio	1, 3, 21	I, O, R	I
2. Khaaliq, Omar Abdul, Artist-Poet, *Ummah Al-Nur*	1, 26, 28	O, R	IV

* Due to transcription difficulties, testimony is not included in this report.

SUMMARY

Based on the most frequent citations across the categories of problems, solutions, and resources by the 41 testifiers**, the three major problems in Detroit were: (1) a tie between crime, violence, and vandalism, and general unemployment/youth unemployment; and (2) the inability of schools to meet the diverse needs of students. The most popular solution offered by the testifiers was that of establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students. The combination of local, state, and federal resources was most often cited as either potential or actual in helping individuals or groups in their efforts to solve problems in Detroit.

The number of testifiers and their citations are arrayed by their group interests and sex in Table VI.

A brief analysis of the table reveals: the citation of either crime, violence, and vandalism or general unemployment/youth unemployment was uniform across groups in Detroit, with the notable exceptions of the PTA and parents/citizens; the mentioning of collaborative partnerships as a solution was most pronounced among school, government, and parents/citizens' groups; and the combining of resources in addressing urban problems was most popular with business, school, and government groups.

** There were actually 45 testifiers, but because of transcription difficulties with four, only 41 are included in the counts.

TABLE VI

NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND SEX: DETROIT

GROUP	NO. OF TESTIFIERS	SEX	PROBLEM	SOLUTION	RESOURCE
PTA	3	Men-0 Women-3	• -	• -	• -
Business	4	Men-2 Women-2	• •	• •	IV I
School Leaders	8	Men-8 Women-0	5 •	R •	IV •
Students	5	Men-3 Women-2	19 •	O O	I •

TABLE VI (continued)

Govt. Off.	4	Men-1 Women-3	• •	• R	• I, IV
Teachers	0				
Labor Leaders	0				
Comm. Leaders	19	Men-12 Women-7	- -	- -	- -
Clergy	0				
Parents/ Citizens	2	Men-2 Women-0	1 •	O, R •	• •
TOTALS	45	Men-28 Women-17			

• means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

- Due to transcription difficulties, testimony is not included in this report.

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

A National Conference entitled "The PTA Challenges the Nation's Leader: What Can We *Do* for Our Schools?" was held in Washington, D.C., on May 15, 1979 at the HEW Building, in the Snow Room, #5051, 330 Independence Avenue, S.W., from 9:00 a.m. until 5:00 p.m. Fourteen conferees, representing diverse national organizations and federal agencies, discussed the five most frequently cited problems and issues in the previous six urban hearings, with a panel consisting of 14 Urban Task Force members.

The five problems were:

1. Inadequate financing of public education
2. Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
3. Low academic achievement and poor student performance
4. Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
5. General unemployment/Youth unemployment

CONFEREES

The conferees were: Frank X. Viggiano, Executive Director, United States Student Association; Dr. Richard Batchelder, Vice-president, American Federation of Teachers; Elayne Brodie, Chairlady, National Coalition of ESEA Title I Parents; Millicent Woods, Associate Director for Education, Employment, and Training, Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Dr. Ronald L. Smith, Deputy Executive Director, Education Commission of the States; Dr. George W. Jones, Regional Director of Affiliate Relations, National Education Association; Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond, Director of Excellence in Education Program, National Urban Coalition; Carol Becker, Staff Director of Education Programs, U.S. Conference of Mayors; June Seid, Policy Analyst, Employment and Training Council, U.S. Conference of Mayors; John F. Jennings, Counsel, House Education & Labor Committee, Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education; Samuel W. Hunt, Professional Staff Member, Senate Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Labor, U.S. Department of HEW, Dr. Robert I. Lerman, Special Assistant for Youth Policy, U.S. Department of Labor; Charlotte Freidman, Associate Director for Publications and Information Services, American Association of School Administrators; and Dr. Preston M. Royster, Associate Director, Operations, Teacher Corps Division, U.S. Office of Education.

PANEL MEMBERS

The panel members were: Grace Baisinger, then President, National PTA; Delores Gulledge, Teacher and then President, Louisiana PTA; Dr. Angeline Caruso, Associate Superintendent, Chicago Public Schools; Dr. Alonzo Crim, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia; Dr. John Dobbs, Assistant Superintendent, Michigan State Department of Education; Jean F. Dye, Vice-president for Legislative Activity, National PTA, Chicago; Lenora Dyxin, Past President, Chicago Region PTA; Dr. Val Flores, Department of Curriculum, University of Texas; Dr. Walter C. Farrell, Jr., Department of Community Education, University of Wisconsin; Robert A. MacGregor, President, Chicago United, Chicago; Dr. Mark Shedd, Connecticut Commissioner of Education; Virginia Sparling, then First Vice-president, National PTA,

Chicago; Dr. Leonard Valverde, Department of Educational Administration, University of Texas; and Dr. Columbus Salley, National Consultant to the Urban Education Project, University of Chicago.

SUMMARY

Excerpts from the written and/or oral presentations of conferees to panel members serve as a summary of the National Conference. These excerpts are intended to highlight the opinions, insights, and statements of the conferees in their responses to the problems, solutions, and resources identified through the six national hearings. These excerpts *are not* to be construed as the definitive statements of the substance and scope of any one conferee's testimony, but as insights representative of both the common and disparate views offered by the conferees to the panel. The excerpts are grouped by problems, solutions, and resources mentioned during these deliberations.

PROBLEMS

SCHOOL FINANCES

"Unfortunately, the Proposition 13 mentality will work against adequate funding of not only programs that expand the schools' focus and make it meaningful, but will make it difficult for schools to obtain adequate financing of their core programs."
Frank X. Viggiano, United States Student Association

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

"Unless parents and students feel that education is a priority and can lead to a more fulfilling life overall, they will not care to invest their time and efforts in the school."
Frank X. Viggiano, United States Student Association

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

"Business, along with the general public, believes lack of discipline is the major problem, and seeks stricter rules in dealing with the behavior of young people. The teaching of self-discipline is needed in the formative years.... Students must be prepared to accept that discipline if they are to succeed in their careers."
Millicent W. Woods, Chamber of Commerce of the United States

"Teachers must believe that children can learn."
Preston Royster, United States Office of Education

"Expenditures for compensatory education have not been systematically tied to efforts to deconcentrate poverty and reduce socio-economic isolation. The result, predictably, has been that very little progress has been made in improving the academic performance of students attending poverty area schools."
Charlotte Freidman, American Association of School Administrators

DIVERSE NEEDS OF STUDENTS

"We should offer a variety of teaching and learning environments for the students. No one will be suitable for all. An open, non-structured school works very well for some, while other students need a structured, rigid environment.... There are some students who just can't take tests; we should do something other than declare them to be failures."
Sam Hunt, Senate Appropriations Committee

GENERAL UNEMPLOYMENT/YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

"We believe that education must do a better job of providing students with a sense of community and comprehension of the world of work."
Millicent W. Woods, Chamber of Commerce of the United States

"One issue is whether enough jobs can be created or secured for youth who may want them."
June Seid, United States Conference of Mayors

"Unemployment rates must not be focused on to the exclusion of the employment rate."
Robert I. Lerman, United States Department of Labor

SOLUTIONS

SCHOOL FINANCES

"We need a stable financial base for schools. The current system of funding roulette does a disservice to education. This is, of course, especially true in cities with declining populations and shrinking property rolls. State and local governments will have to move away from the inequities of property tax to a more uniform, stable fi-

nance base. The federal government's role will, I believe, continue to be the provision of targeted, special purpose money to assist with federally imposed or special situations."
Sam Hunt, Senate Appropriations Committee

"We need to look into the future. Is there a better way to fashion school dollars? How can the federal government help states finance schools better with the leverage of federal dollars? We must also rethink federal funding."
John F. Jennings, House Education and Labor Committee

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

"In regard to citizen activism, mayors have found that citizen participation in public issues promotes greater citizen identity with their cities."
Carol Becker, United States Conference of Mayors

"School administrators and school boards must take active steps to involve parents, students, and other concerned citizens in the school's decision-making process. Programs that allow the school to provide some focus for the neighborhood, such as adult evening classes, recreation, activities, etc., should be either established or expanded."
Frank X. Viggiano, United States Student Association

"Parents must be given in-service training in order to deal with school and community-related issues. We need to establish a national needs assessment center for parents."
Elayne Brodie, National Coalition of ESEA Title I Parents

"Must convince state representatives to involve more local people in political process."
Ronald L. Smith, Education Commission of the States

ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND PERFORMANCE

"Business expects greater emphasis on the basics, a return to fundamentals.... Only rarely is the connection made between academic pursuits and occupational experience.... To remedy this, career education should become an integral component of every school's curriculum."
Millicent W. Woods, Chamber of Commerce of the United States

"Many people seem to believe that achievement tests, by themselves, will bring about quality education. While tests—if someone can ever devise culturally unbiased tests—can play a part, they are not a cure-all for education. Personally, I believe competency-based education offers much more promise than standardized achievement tests."
Sam Hunt, Senate Appropriations Committee

DIVERSE NEEDS OF STUDENTS

"Address the education, training, employment, and support service needs of youth through integrated approaches. There must be recognition that these components are not separate and discrete, but are necessary in developing the total individual. The aims are to help youths finish school and to link what they learn on the job to what they learn in the classroom."
June Seid, United States Conference of Mayors

GENERAL UNEMPLOYMENT/YOUTH UNEMPLOYMENT

"Encourage commitment from local elected officials, business, industry, and educators toward improving and expanding the role of the private sector and labor unions in developing training programs, and in transitioning youth from training to unsubsidized employment."
June Seid, United States Conference of Mayors

"I would support legislation that would make state, federal, and local governments the employers of last resort. However, I would encourage private sector employment."
Linda Darling-Hammond, National Urban Coalition

RESOURCES

"Federal government support of suburban governments should be contingent upon their participation in the development and implementation of plans to overcome patterns of segregation, which have been responsible for the deterioration and decay of many central cities and their schools."
Charlotte Freidman, American Association of School Administrators

"The key to most of these problems is money...There does not appear to be much chance of the federal government providing large sums of new money to rebuild urban education. Since most of

the states have surpluses in their treasuries, the real pressure for money should be focused there."

Sam Hunt, Senate Appropriations Committee

Further discussion on the contributions of the National Conference to the data-gathering process of the Urban Education Project will be discussed in the next chapter, which will deal with a cross-site analysis.

CROSS-SITE ANALYSIS OF SIX HEARINGS AND NATIONAL CONFERENCE

4

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a cross-site analysis of the data from the hearings and National Conference. No attempt is made to "evaluate or assess" the effectiveness of how any one site(s) is dealing with the issues peculiar to urban areas.

The intent of the cross-site analysis is to show some of the commonalities and differences of views among testifiers—from similar and different backgrounds and group interests—as they responded to urban problems and challenges through the formats of the hearings and National Conference.

CROSS-SITE ANALYSIS

Table VII shows all the testifiers at the six hearings by the arbitrary grouping used in order to get a sense of some of their collective views on urban issues and problems.

Using the criterion of the most frequently cited or modal problem or issue as an indicator of a priority or concern, the following were the "number one" problems, solutions, and resources cited by testifiers across the six hearing sites when grouped.

Note that (---) means that no particular Problem, Solution, or Resource was cited by a certain group of testifiers, either because there were too few testifiers in a group, or because no *two* testifiers in any one particular group chose the same Problem, Solution, or Resource.

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF TESTIFIERS BY GROUP AND HEARING

GROUP	MIAMI	SEATTLE	PHILA-DELPHIA	HOUSTON	KANSAS CITY	DETROIT	TOTALS	%
PTA	2	5	3	6	5	3	24	9.8
Business	3	2	8	1	4	4	22	8.9
School Leaders	10	4	5	10	13	8	50	20.3
Students	1	3	3	1	3	5	16	6.5
Govt. Off.	5	6	1	3	1	4	20	8.1
Teachers	1	3	1	0	0	0	5	2.0
Labor Leaders	0	4	2	1	0	0	7	2.8
Comm. Leaders	10	19	14	4	10	19	76	30.9
Clergy	2	1	1	1	1	0	6	2.4
Citizens/ Parents	6	3	4	3	2	2	20	8.1
Totals	40	50	42	30	39	45	246	100.0

"NUMBER ONE PROBLEM" CITED BY GROUPED TESTIFIERS

PTA

Philadelphia: Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
Seattle: Decline of health and social services
Miami: ---
Houston: Teacher unions and collective-bargaining agreements
Kansas City: Negative public attitudes about public education
Detroit: ---

BUSINESS

Philadelphia: Discipline; Inadequate financing of public education; Teacher unions

Seattle: ---

Miami: ---

Houston: ---

Kansas City: ---

Detroit: ---

SCHOOL LEADERS

Philadelphia: Inadequate financing of public education

Seattle: Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students

Miami: (tie) Inadequate financing of public education; Negative public attitudes about public education; General unemployment/Youth unemployment; Financial overburden of urban school districts

Houston: (tie) Discipline; Negative public attitudes about public education; White/black flight and the decline of urban tax base; Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators; Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students; Lack of multi-cultural and multi-racial curricula and programs

Kansas City: Low academic achievement and poor student performance; Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools

Detroit: Negative public attitudes about public education

STUDENTS

Philadelphia: Low academic achievement and poor student performance; Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools

Seattle: Declining enrollments

Miami: ---

Houston: ---

Kansas City: (tie) Inadequate preparation and performance of teachers and school administrators; Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students; Lack of sound compensatory or special education programs

Detroit: Alienation of parents and students from school decision-making

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: (tie) Inadequate financing of public education; Financial overburden of urban school districts; Declining enrollments
Miami: Crime, violence, and vandalism
Houston: Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
Kansas City: --
Detroit: ---

TEACHERS
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: ---
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

LABOR LEADERS
Philadelphia: Inadequate financing of public education
Seattle: ---
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

COMMUNITY LEADERS
Philadelphia: (tie) Inadequate financing of public education; Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
Seattle: (tie) Low academic achievement and poor student performance; Financial overburden of urban school districts
Miami: Inadequate financing of public education
Houston: Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
Kansas City: (tie) Low academic achievement and poor student performance; Erosion of biblical mores; Adolescent pregnancy
Detroit: ---

CLERGY
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: ---
Miami: ---
Houston: ---

Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

PARENTS/CITIZENS
Philadelphia: Conflicts from political and self-interest groups
Seattle: Decline in health and social services
Miami: Inadequate financing of public schools
Houston: Negative public attitudes about public education
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: Crime, violence, and vandalism

"NUMBER ONE SOLUTION" CITED BY GROUPED TESTIFIERS

PTA
Philadelphia: More parental involvement in total educative process
Seattle: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
Miami: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
Houston: Providing full state funding; Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
Kansas City: Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
Detroit: ---

BUSINESS
Philadelphia: Increased federal funding
Seattle: ---
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: (tie) Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
Detroit: ---

SCHOOL LEADERS
Philadelphia: Designing special programs to motivate and improve student performance
Seattle: ---
Miami: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

Houston: (tie) Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students; Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula

Kansas City: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

Detroit: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

STUDENTS

Philadelphia: Designing special programs to motivate and improve student achievement

Seattle: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

Miami: ---

Houston: ---

Kansas City: (tie) Providing programs to improve pre- and in-service training of teachers and administrators; Providing student job training; Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance

Detroit: Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Philadelphia: ---

Seattle: (tie) Establishing state-wide urban education policy which includes an urban overburden factor; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

Miami: ---

Houston: Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process

Kansas City: ---

Detroit: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

TEACHERS

Philadelphia: ---

Seattle: (tie) Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance; Establishing multi-racial and multi-cultural curricula

Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

LABOR LEADERS

Philadelphia: Alternative methods of financing public education
Seattle: (tie) Providing full state funding; Establishing statewide urban education policy which includes an urban overburden factor
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

COMMUNITY LEADERS

Philadelphia: (tie) Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process; Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
Seattle: (tie) Establishing state-wide education policy which includes an urban overburden factor; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
Miami: (tie) Providing full or increased state funding; Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
Houstin: (tie) Developing parenting centers; Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process
Kansas City: (tie) Returning to biblical teaching and precepts; Modifying or eliminating Planned Parenthood programs; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students
Detroit: ---

CLERGY

Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: ---
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

PARENTS/CITIZENS

Philadelphia: Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

Seattle: ---

Miami: (tie) Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

Houston: (tie) Ensuring more parental involvement in total educative process; Considering alternative methods of financing public education

Kansas City: ---

Detroit: (tie) Designing special programs to motivate, reward, and improve student performance; Establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students

"NUMBER ONE RESOURCE" CITED BY GROUPED TESTIFIERS

PTA

Philadelphia: ---

Seattle: Combined state, local, and federal

Miami: ---

Houston: Local

Kansas City: Combined state, local, and federal

Detroit: ---

BUSINESS

Philadelphia: Local

Seattle: ---

Miami: Local

Houston: ---

Kansas City: Local

Detroit: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal

SCHOOL LEADERS

Philadelphia: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal

Seattle: Local

Miami: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal

Houston: Local

Kansas City: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal

Detroit: Combined state, local, and federal

STUDENTS
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: Local
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: (tie) Local; Group specific
Detroit: Local

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: (tie) Local; State
Miami: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal; Group specific
Houston: Group specific
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal

TEACHERS
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: Local
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

LABOR LEADERS
Philadelphia: Combined state, local, and federal
Seattle: Combined state, local, and federal
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

COMMUNITY LEADERS
Philadelphia: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal
Seattle: Local
Miami: Combined state, local, and federal
Houston: Combined state, local, and federal; Group specific
Kansas City: (tie) Local; Combined state, local, and federal; Group specific
Detroit: ---

CLERGY
Philadelphia: ---
Seattle: ---
Miami: ---
Houston: ---
Kansas City: ---
Detroit: ---

PARENTS/CITIZENS
Philadelphia: Local
Seattle: Local
Miami: Combined state, local, and federal
Houston: Combined state, local, and federal
Kansas City: Local
Detroit: ---

In looking for some kind of "consensus" among and between testifiers when grouped, a further analysis of their number one problems, solutions, and resources revealed:

School leaders across the hearing sites most frequently cited negative public attitudes about public education as a major problem; community leaders view inadequate financing, lack of parental involvement, and low academic achievement as top problems.

Establishing collaborative partnerships is a number one shared solution of school leaders, government officials, and community leaders across the hearing sites; PTA groups favor more parental involvement as a solution to urban problems; and students seek solutions to their perceived urban school problems through the designing of special programs to motivate and improve student achievement.

Business, school leaders, students, and government officials would rely more heavily on local resources in dealing with urban problems. On the other hand, PTA members and labor/community leaders would rely on a combination of state, local, and federal resources in dealing with major urban problems.

SUMMARY

TEN CRITICAL PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED THROUGH THE HEARINGS

Based on the most frequent or modal citations by testifiers across the six cities to the list of problems presented them and a list of

their own problems, the following represent in rank order the top ten problems from among the three most frequently cited problems at each hearing site:

1. Inadequate financing of public education
2. Lack of parental or broad-based community participation in schools
3. Low academic achievement and poor student performance
4. Inability of schools to meet diverse needs of students
5. General unemployment/Youth unemployment
6. Negative public attitudes about public education
7. The financial overburden of urban school districts
8. General violence in both schools and communities

9/10. Tie between Discipline and Preparation of teachers

In looking at this list of problems, it should be noted that the majority of testifiers refused to prioritize the original list of concerns presented them by the Task Force. Thus, a more useful and meaningful way of interpreting the "importance" they ascribed to these concerns was to look at the frequency of citation. Also, many testifiers refused to mention all of the Task Force concerns; this created a distortion as to the importance that could be assigned to any particular problem. Most testifiers saw these problems as being interrelated and some as symptoms and not problems.

Based on the most frequent citations from all testifiers concerning solutions and resources for dealing with these problems, the most popular solution was establishing collaborative partnerships which involve diverse publics, teachers, and students. Second was greater parental involvement in the total educative process.

By far, the most popular resource cited in dealing with these problems was local, suggesting that testifiers feel more comfortable using local initiatives, rather than either state or federal ones.

RESULTS OF NATIONAL CONFERENCE

As noted previously (see page 72), conferees at the National Conference were asked to respond to the top five of the ten critical problems identified through the public hearings. The Conference, as such, did not generate any additional lists of problems. The conferees' responses provided useful data as to the views and strategies

of representative national organizations in dealing with these recurring problems and issues. Highlights of these views and strategies were shared in Chapter 3 of this report.

The expert opinions offered by the conferees corroborated an emergent view of the Task Force: that the educational issues which surfaced during the public hearings were not solely the problems of six large urban school systems, but represented the problems of public education throughout America—urban, suburban, and rural.

The final chapter will summarize the major outcomes of Phase I of the Urban Education Project and discuss some specific actions to be taken in view of the results and/or findings from the public hearings and National Conference.

SUMMARY OF PHASE I OUTCOMES AND DISCUSSION OF FUTURE ACTIONS

5

The purpose of this chapter is to present specific recommendations of the Urban Advisory Task Force to the National PTA in light of the results or outcomes from Phase I of the Urban Education Project.

As discussed previously, *the stated goals of the Urban Education Project were:*

To focus national attention on the problems of our urban areas and, especially, the schools within them;

To develop new and dynamic approaches to the resolution of these problems, e.g., developing new alliances or coalitions to attack the urban problems; and

To make parents the leading force in this new endeavor.

The explicit goals of the public hearings and National Conference were:

To identify and clarify the crucial problems confronting urban areas and their schools;

To select the most pressing concerns;

To examine effective ways in which various cities across the U.S. are responding to these challenges; and

To develop new and dynamic strategies for solving urban problems, with parents being the leading force in this endeavor.

More specifically, the public hearings were designed to serve as a forum in which parents, students, civic leaders, school administrators, national leaders, and other interested individuals would have

the opportunity to discuss the urgent educational problems of our cities and to suggest possible solutions.

Given the sheer complexity of the problems and issues besetting urban life and its schools, and the arduous challenge of being a *party* to the resolution of such problems, neither the National PTA nor the Urban Advisory Task Force ever held the expectation of meeting all of the above goals in the two years since the beginning of the Urban Education Project. Nonetheless, much has been accomplished in regard to these goals. These results serve as a data base and rationale for the Urban Advisory Task Force's recommendations.

The results or outcomes will be discussed briefly.

REVIEW OF OUTCOMES

1. NATIONAL ATTENTION

National attention has been focused on the problems of urban areas and their schools through the conducting of the hearings, and the resultant publicity these events generated in newspapers, radio, and TV. Interviews of Task Force members and PTA staff, media coverage of the hearing proceedings, and the use of radio/TV spots to promote the hearings all contributed to increasing national awareness of the Urban Education Project and its areas of concern.

The National Conference was a culminating act in creating public awareness when 14 national organizations provided their perspectives on urban problems and issues at a meeting in Washington, D.C.

In order to obtain maximum media coverage for all these events, the National PTA designed a comprehensive publicity plan for each of the cities involved.

The intent of the National PTA is to achieve *sustained* national attention on the plight and opportunities of urban areas. The National PTA believes that national efforts toward resolving the issues of urban education are mandated by the extent and severity of the problems identified through the hearings and conference.

2. IDENTIFICATION AND CLARIFICATION OF CRUCIAL URBAN PROBLEMS

The hearings and National Conference enabled the National PTA and the Urban Advisory Task Force to collect much needed data on urban areas and schools. In Chapter 4, the ten most frequently

cited problems of testifiers—who represented the diversity of views in urban areas—will now permit the Task Force to select, from among them, the most pressing for action. The hearings and conference have had the additional effect of confirming many of the views and perceptions of the Task Force about the broad scope of problems faced by urban constituencies.

3. THE BEGINNINGS OF LOCAL AND NATIONAL COALITIONS

The public discussion of the problems and solutions for urban education in both the hearings and National Conference served the purpose of identifying possible linkages that may be formed between the PTA and other organizations. Thus, different alliances may be developed to work toward the common goals that each organization has for urban education. The new coalitions of concerned individuals and organizations at local, state, and national levels to work on the educational issues of urban areas are viewed as a new and dynamic approach.

Beginnings of these coalitions have been initiated by the following actions: Results of the local hearings and National Conference were provided to local and state PTA officers, testifiers, conferees, and various public and educational leaders in each of the cities where the meetings were conducted. A follow-up meeting with those who have testified has been arranged by local or state PTA officials in order to discuss the hearing results in depth and to build the new coalitions of individuals and organizations to attack the problems of their urban schools. Assistance and consultation in coalition building at each of the cities is being provided by the staff of the National PTA.

Thus, the three significant outcomes of Phase I of the Urban Education Project were: (1) the focusing of national attention on urban problems; (2) the identifying and clarifying of urban problems and issues; and (3) the beginnings of local and national coalitions.

The next section of this chapter will look at some specific actions to be taken by the Urban Advisory Task Force in view of the above outcomes.

TASK FORCE ACTIONS

Members of the Urban Advisory Task Force were given the oppor-

tunity to make recommendations for future actions of the National PTA on the problems and issues identified through Phase I activities in a letter sent them by Virginia Sparling, President, National PTA, on August 22, 1979.

The majority of Task Force members who responded to Mrs. Sparling's letter saw coalition building at all levels as a major feature of the National PTA's continuing effort at finding solutions to the complex problems of urban education. They were careful to mention that the solutions to the problems in our urban areas and urban schools are beyond the resources of any single organization, including the National PTA. Thus, they saw the role of the National PTA to be that of facilitator of the development of local, state, and national coalitions. Task Force members saw the coalition building process as involving:

Identification of mutual concerns and goals for urban education among the different groups of individuals and organizations;

Meetings to establish the potential benefits of coordinated and joint actions on the problems of urban education;

The assessment of the resources available in the coalitions to undertake coordinated actions on specific kinds of problems;

The development of mutually agreed upon courses of action that could be implemented, in part or as a whole, by joint efforts; and

The determination of a management plan and the allocation of tasks among the coalition members to implement the specific courses of action.

Having identified coalition building as an overarching objective and strategy for dealing with the problems of our urban areas and schools, the question still remains: Coalitions for what? In responding to this question, the Task Force reconvened in Chicago on October 23, 1979, to discuss the results and findings from Phase I activities. A subcommittee was identified to develop a plan of action for the National PTA which will include: issues or themes around which coalitions will be built; specific strategies for involving students and parents as change agents; specific ways of involving the Urban Advisory Task Force; and specific strategies and techniques for realizing the goals or objectives of national and local coalitions.

This Action Plan will be released in February 1980.